

EXHIBIT 1

CLAIM 143

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
(State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410
Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.</u> Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)	
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____	
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____	
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022, U.S.A. Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) See summary page Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>
	Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g) Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____	
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY	
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____	



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____ ____ ____ ____
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>	
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> . <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable	
10.	Is this claim based on a lease? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____	
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____	



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director - Company: HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., by Harbo

Company by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LL
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 U.S.A. Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 4:40:16 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director - Company: HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., by HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P., its Gen Partner Company: by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Managing Member		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P. (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118].* As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third Amended Joint Plan (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827]* and related filings in the Acis

bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor's employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such

documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor,

as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or

other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

CLAIM 147

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
 (State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410 Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.</u> Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)	
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____	
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____	
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? <u>HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.</u> <u>Attn: Erica Weisgerber</u> <u>Debevoise and Plimpton LLP</u> <u>919 Third Avenue</u> <u>New York, NY 10022, U.S.A.</u> Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) <u>See summary page</u> Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>
	Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g) Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____	
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY	
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____	



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>	
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> . <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable	
10.	Is this claim based on a lease? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____	
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____	



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., by HarbourVest

Company Inv Fund Mgr, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address _____

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 4:49:59 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners Ireland Limited, its Alternative Company: Inv Fund Mgr, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Gen Ptr		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P. (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118].* As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third Amended Joint Plan (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827]* and related filings in the Acis

bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor's employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such

documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor,

as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or

other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

CLAIM 150

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
(State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410
Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. Do not send original documents; they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.</u> Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)	
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____	
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____	
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? See summary page	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) See summary page
Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g)	Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>
	Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____	
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY	
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____	



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____	
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).	
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>		
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i>. <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable </div>		
10.	Is this claim based on a lease? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____		
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____		



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.,

Company Inv Fund Mgr, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investme
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 U.S.A. Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 4:59:00 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., by HarbourVest Partners Ireland Limited, its Alter Company: Inv Fund Mgr, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Gen Ptr		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118].* As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third Amended Joint Plan (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827]* and related filings in the Acis

bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor's employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such

documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor,

as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or

other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

CLAIM 153

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
 (State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410 **Proof of Claim**

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HV International VIII Secondary L.P.</u> Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)	
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____	
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____	
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? <u>HV International VIII Secondary L.P.</u> Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022, U.S.A. Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) See summary page Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>
	Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g) Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____	
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY	
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____	



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____	
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).	
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>		
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i>. <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px; margin-top: 20px;"> Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px; margin-top: 20px;"> Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px; margin-top: 20px;"> Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px; margin-top: 20px;"> Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable </div>		
10.	Is this claim based on a lease? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____		
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____		



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director-Company: HV International VIII Secondary L.P., by HII

Company by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LL
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HV International VIII Secondary L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HV International VIII Secondary L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 U.S.A. Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 5:16:54 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director-Company: HV International VIII Secondary L.P., by HIPEP VIII Associates L.P., its General Partner, Company: by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Managing Member		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HV International VIII Secondary L.P. (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118].* As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third Amended Joint Plan (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827]* and related filings in the Acis

bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor's employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such

documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor,

as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or

other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

CLAIM 154

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
 (State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410 Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.</u> Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)	
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____	
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____	
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? <u>HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.</u> <u>Attn: Erica Weisgerber</u> <u>Debevoise and Plimpton LLP</u> <u>919 Third Avenue</u> <u>New York, NY 10022, U.S.A.</u> Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) <u>See summary page</u> Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>
	Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g) Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____	
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ MM / DD / YYYY	
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____	



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____ ____ ____ ____
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>	
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> . <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable	
10.	Is this claim based on a lease? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____	
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____	



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., by HarbourVest

Company Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investme
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 5:11:50 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director-Company: HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners Ireland Limited, its Alternative Inv Company: Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Gen Ptr		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition* (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118]. As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third Amended Joint Plan* (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827] and related filings

in the Acis bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor's employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such

documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor,

as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or

other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

CLAIM 149

Fill in this information to identify the case:

Debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P.

United States Bankruptcy Court for the: Northern District of Texas
 (State)

Case number 19-34054

Official Form 410 Proof of Claim

04/19

Read the instructions before filling out this form. This form is for making a claim for payment in a bankruptcy case. Do not use this form to make a request for payment of an administrative expense. Make such a request according to 11 U.S.C. § 503.

Filers must leave out or redact information that is entitled to privacy on this form or on any attached documents. Attach redacted copies or any documents that support the claim, such as promissory notes, purchase orders, invoices, itemized statements of running accounts, contracts, judgments, mortgages, and security agreements. **Do not send original documents;** they may be destroyed after scanning. If the documents are not available, explain in an attachment.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Fill in all the information about the claim as of the date the case was filed. That date is on the notice of bankruptcy (Form 309) that you received.

Part 1: Identify the Claim

1. Who is the current creditor?	<u>HarbourVest Partners L.P. on behalf of funds and accounts under management</u> <small>Name of the current creditor (the person or entity to be paid for this claim)</small>		
	Other names the creditor used with the debtor _____		
2. Has this claim been acquired from someone else?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. From whom? _____		
3. Where should notices and payments to the creditor be sent?	Where should notices to the creditor be sent? See summary page	Where should payments to the creditor be sent? (if different) See summary page	
Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 2002(g)			
	Contact phone <u>2129096000</u> Contact email <u>eweisgerber@debevoise.com</u>	Contact phone <u>6173483773</u> Contact email <u>agoren@harbourvest.com</u>	
Uniform claim identifier for electronic payments in chapter 13 (if you use one): _____			
4. Does this claim amend one already filed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Claim number on court claims registry (if known) _____ Filed on _____ <div style="text-align: right;"><small>MM / DD / YYYY</small></div>		
5. Do you know if anyone else has filed a proof of claim for this claim?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Who made the earlier filing? _____		



Part 2: Give Information About the Claim as of the Date the Case Was Filed

6.	Do you have any number you use to identify the debtor?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Last 4 digits of the debtor's account or any number you use to identify the debtor: ____	
7.	How much is the claim? \$ <u>See Annex</u>	Does this amount include interest or other charges? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Attach statement itemizing interest, fees, expenses, or other charges required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c)(2)(A).	
8.	What is the basis of the claim? Examples: Goods sold, money loaned, lease, services performed, personal injury or wrongful death, or credit card. Attach redacted copies of any documents supporting the claim required by Bankruptcy Rule 3001(c). Limit disclosing information that is entitled to privacy, such as health care information. <u>See Annex</u>		
9.	Is all or part of the claim secured?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. The claim is secured by a lien on property. Nature or property: <input type="checkbox"/> Real estate: If the claim is secured by the debtor's principle residence, file a <i>Mortgage Proof of Claim Attachment</i> (Official Form 410-A) with this <i>Proof of Claim</i> . <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Describe: _____ Basis for perfection: _____ Attach redacted copies of documents, if any, that show evidence of perfection of a security interest (for example, a mortgage, lien, certificate of title, financing statement, or other document that shows the lien has been filed or recorded.) Value of property: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is secured: \$ _____ Amount of the claim that is unsecured: \$ _____ (The sum of the secured and unsecured amount should match the amount in line 7.) Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition: \$ _____ Annual Interest Rate (when case was filed) _____ % <input type="checkbox"/> Fixed <input type="checkbox"/> Variable	
10.	Is this claim based on a lease?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Amount necessary to cure any default as of the date of the petition. \$ _____	
11.	Is this claim subject to a right of setoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes. Identify the property: _____	



12. Is all or part of the claim entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)?

A claim may be partly priority and partly nonpriority. For example, in some categories, the law limits the amount entitled to priority.

☒ No

☐ Yes. Check all that apply:

☐ Domestic support obligations (including alimony and child support) under 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(1)(A) or (a)(1)(B).

☐ Up to \$3,025* of deposits toward purchase, lease, or rental of property or services for personal, family, or household use. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(7).

☐ Wages, salaries, or commissions (up to \$13,650*) earned within 180 days before the bankruptcy petition is filed or the debtor's business ends, whichever is earlier. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(4).

☐ Taxes or penalties owed to governmental units. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(8).

☐ Contributions to an employee benefit plan. 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)(5).

☐ Other. Specify subsection of 11 U.S.C. § 507(a)() that applies.

Amount entitled to priority

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

* Amounts are subject to adjustment on 4/01/22 and every 3 years after that for cases begun on or after the date of adjustment.

13. Is all or part of the claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(9)?

☒ No

☐ Yes. Indicate the amount of your claim arising from the value of any goods received by the debtor within 20 days before the date of commencement of the above case, in which the goods have been sold to the Debtor in the ordinary course of such Debtor's business. Attach documentation supporting such claim.

\$ _____

Part 3: Sign Below

The person completing this proof of claim must sign and date it. FRBP 9011(b).

If you file this claim electronically, FRBP 5005(a)(2) authorizes courts to establish local rules specifying what a signature is.

A person who files a fraudulent claim could be fined up to \$500,000, imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both. 18 U.S.C. §§ 152, 157, and 3571.

Check the appropriate box:

☐ I am the creditor.

☒ I am the creditor's attorney or authorized agent.

☐ I am the trustee, or the debtor, or their authorized agent. Bankruptcy Rule 3004.

☐ I am a guarantor, surety, endorser, or other codebtor. Bankruptcy Rule 3005.

I understand that an authorized signature on this *Proof of Claim* serves as an acknowledgement that when calculating the amount of the claim, the creditor gave the debtor credit for any payments received toward the debt.

I have examined the information in this *Proof of Claim* and have reasonable belief that the information is true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on date 04/08/2020
MM / DD / YYYY

/s/Michael Pugatch
Signature

Print the name of the person who is completing and signing this claim:

Name Michael Pugatch
First name Middle name Last name

Title Managing Director

Company HarbourVest Partners L.P., on behalf of funds and accounts under manage
Identify the corporate servicer as the company if the authorized agent is a servicer.

Address

Contact phone _____

Email _____



For phone assistance: Domestic (877) 573-3984 | International (310) 751-1829

Debtor: 19-34054 - Highland Capital Management, L.P. District: Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division		
Creditor: HarbourVest Partners L.P. on behalf of funds and accounts under management Attn: Erica Weisgerber Debevoise and Plimpton LLP 919 Third Avenue New York, NY, 10022 U.S.A. Phone: 2129096000 Phone 2: Fax: Email: eweisgerber@debevoise.com	Has Supporting Documentation: Yes, supporting documentation successfully uploaded Related Document Statement:	
	Has Related Claim: No Related Claim Filed By:	
	Filing Party: Authorized agent	
Disbursement/Notice Parties: HarbourVest Partners L.P. c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC One Financial Center Boston, MA, 02111 U.S.A. Phone: 6173483773 Phone 2: Fax: E-mail: agoren@harbourvest.com DISBURSEMENT ADDRESS		
Other Names Used with Debtor:	Amends Claim: No Acquired Claim: No	
Basis of Claim: See Annex	Last 4 Digits: No	Uniform Claim Identifier:
Total Amount of Claim: See Annex	Includes Interest or Charges: None	
Has Priority Claim: No	Priority Under:	
Has Secured Claim: No Amount of 503(b)(9): No Based on Lease: No Subject to Right of Setoff: No	Nature of Secured Amount: Value of Property: Annual Interest Rate: Arrearage Amount: Basis for Perfection: Amount Unsecured:	
Submitted By: Michael Pugatch on 08-Apr-2020 5:06:59 p.m. Eastern Time Title: Managing Director Company: HarbourVest Partners L.P., on behalf of funds and accounts under management, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Gen Partner		

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054 (SGJ)

ANNEX TO PROOF OF CLAIM

1. This annex (the “Annex”) is part of and is incorporated by reference into the attached proof of claim (together with the Annex, the “Proof of Claim”) and describes in more detail the claims of HarbourVest Partners L.P. on behalf of funds and accounts under management (the “Claimant”) against the debtor Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”).

2. The Claimant manages investment funds that are limited partners in one of the Debtor’s managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, “Acis”), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the “Court”) on January 30, 2018. The Acis bankruptcy filing resulted from a dispute between Debtor and its former employee, Joshua Terry, who served as portfolio manager for Debtor’s collateral loan obligations funds (“CLO”) business. *See, e.g., Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Orders for Relief Issued After Trial on Contested Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition* (“Involuntary Petition Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No. 118]. As noted in more detail in the Court’s *Bench Ruling and Memorandum of Law in Support of: (A) Final Approval of Disclosure Statement; and (B) Confirmation of Chapter 11 Trustee’s Third*

Amended Joint Plan (“Confirmation Ruling”) [Case No. 18-30264 (SGJ), Dkt. No 827] and related filings in the Acis bankruptcy cases, there has been extensive litigation regarding alleged improper conduct associated with the management of, and transactions relating to, Acis, including transactions with and related to HCLOF. *See, e.g., id.; Second Amended Complaint* [Case No. 18-03078(SGJ), Dkt. No. 157].

3. Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor’s employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF. *See, e.g., Involuntary Petition Ruling* ¶ 27; *see also Confirmation Ruling*.

4. Claimant hereby files this Claim to assert any and all of its rights to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the foregoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various agreements with the Debtor in connection with HCLOF (including, but not limited to, the Subscription and Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., dated as of November 15, 2017, the Members Agreement Relating to the Company, dated as of November 15, 2017, the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Offering Memorandum dated November 15, 2017), and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the foregoing harm.

5. The Claimant has not attached the documentation supporting this Claim to this Proof of Claim because the documentation is voluminous and the Debtor has copies of such documents. However, any requested relevant documents will be provided to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, the Court, the United States Trustee and the Debtor in the event of a dispute regarding this Proof of Claim and will be made available for review by other parties in interest as appropriate upon reasonable request and after consultation with the Debtor and execution of appropriate confidentiality agreements.

6. This Proof of Claim is filed with a full reservation of rights, including the right to amend, update, modify, supplement or otherwise revise this Proof of Claim in any respect at any time. The filing of this Proof of Claim is not and should not be construed to be: (a) a waiver or release of any of the Claimant's rights against any person, entity or property accruing to it against the Debtor and its estate; (b) a waiver of the Claimant's rights to assert that 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(C) is unconstitutional; (c) a consent or submission by the Claimant, or waiver of the Claimant's rights to object, to the jurisdiction of this Court with respect to the subject matter of any of the claims described herein, or any objection or other proceeding commenced with respect to any of the claims described herein, or any other proceeding commenced in the Debtor's chapter 11 case against or otherwise involving the Claimant; (d) a waiver or release of any right of the Claimant, or consent by the Claimant, to a trial by jury in this or any other court or proceeding; (e) a waiver or release of, or any limitation on, any right of the Claimant to have orders entered only after *de novo* review by a United States District Judge; (f) an election of remedies; or (g) a waiver of, or any other limitation on, any right of the Claimant to request withdrawal of the reference with respect to any matter, including, without limitation, any matter relating to this Proof of Claim.

7. Claimant's express reservation of all rights and causes of action, includes, without limitation, contingent or unliquidated rights that it or its affiliates may have against the Debtor, as well as defenses, offsets and counterclaims. This description and classification of claims by the Claimant is not a concession or admission as to the correct characterization or treatment of any such claims or a waiver of any rights of the Claimant.

8. Furthermore, the Claimant expressly reserves its rights to (a) file additional proofs of claim for additional claims that may be based on the same or additional documents or facts or other liability or indebtedness of the Debtor to the Claimant under contract or otherwise; (b) assert claims for cure of defaults in any agreement that the Debtor or any trustee appointed in this chapter 11 case may seek to assume; (c) assert any and all other claims, causes of action, defenses, offsets or counterclaims against the Debtor or any other parties; (d) file a request for payment of an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. §§ 503 and 507 for any or all of the claims or rights of payment described above and any additional amounts; and (e) seek recovery through any relevant third parties, including any of the Debtor's insurance coverage providers.

9. This Proof of Claim does not encompass all claims that the Claimant or its affiliates may have that arise after the Petition Date and are entitled to administrative priority, and the Claimant expressly reserves its right to file such claim or any similar claim at the appropriate time, including any such post-petition claims arising under these service contracts.

10. This Proof of Claim is filed without prejudice to the filing by the Claimant of additional proofs of claim or requests for payment with respect to any other indebtedness, liability or obligation of the Debtor. The Claimant does not, by this Proof of Claim or any amendment or other action, waive any rights with respect to any scheduled claim.

11. The Claimant reserves the right to withdraw, amend, clarify, modify or supplement this Proof of Claim to assert additional claims, causes of action or additional grounds for this Proof of Claim (including adding any additional contracts, agreements, obligations or other relationships between the Claimant and the Debtor), as well as the right to file any separate or additional proofs of claim with respect to the claims set forth herein or otherwise, including for the purpose of fixing and liquidating any contingent or unliquidated claim set forth herein, or to file additional proofs of claim in respect of additional amounts or for any other reason.

12. In executing and filing this Proof of Claim, the Claimant does not submit to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas for any purpose other than with respect to this Proof of Claim against the Debtor, and does not waive or release any rights or remedies against any other person or entity that may be liable for all or part of this Proof of Claim.

13. The Claimant otherwise reserves its rights, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Claimant's rights, under any order of the Court previously entered in this chapter 11 case.

14. Payments on account of this Proof of Claim should be sent to the Claimant at the address specified for notices to the Claimant in Part 1.3 of the Proof of Claim.

EXHIBIT 2

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No. 143717) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 266326) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (NY Bar No. 5612569) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
Facsimile: (310) 201-0760

HAYWARD & ASSOCIATES PLLC
Melissa S. Hayward (TX Bar No. 24044908)
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable (TX Bar No. 24053075)
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, TX 75231
Telephone: (972) 755-7100
Facsimile: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for the Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:	§	
	§	Chapter 11
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P., ¹	§	Case No. 19-34054-sgj11
	§	
Debtor.	§	

**DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER APPROVING
SETTLEMENT WITH HARBOURVEST (CLAIM NOS. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154)
AND AUTHORIZING ACTIONS CONSISTENT THEREWITH**

TO THE HONORABLE STACEY G. C. JERNIGAN,
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

¹ The last four digits of the Debtor's taxpayer identification number are 6725. The headquarters and service address for the Debtor is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201.



Highland Capital Management, L.P., the above-captioned debtor and debtor-in-possession (“Highland” or the “Debtor”), files this motion (the “Motion”) for entry of an order, substantially in the form attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, pursuant to Rule 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”), approving a settlement agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”),² a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 to the *Declaration of John A. Morris in Support of the Debtor’s Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* being filed simultaneously with this Motion (“Morris Dec.”), that, among other things, fully and finally resolves the proofs of claim filed by HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (collectively, “HarbourVest”). In support of this Motion, the Debtor represents as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This matter is a core proceeding within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

2. The statutory predicates for the relief sought herein are sections 105(a) and 363 of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”), and Rule 9019 of the Bankruptcy Rules.

² All capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings given to them in the Settlement Agreement.

RELEVANT BACKGROUND

A. Procedural Background

3. On October 16, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code in the Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 19-12239 (CSS) (the “Delaware Court”).

4. On October 29, 2019, the official committee of unsecured creditors (the “Committee”) was appointed by the U.S. Trustee in the Delaware Court.

5. On December 4, 2019, the Delaware Court entered an order transferring venue of the Debtor’s case to this Court [Docket No. 186].³

6. On December 27, 2019, the Debtor filed that certain *Motion of the Debtor for Approval of Settlement with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Regarding Governance of the Debtor and Procedures for Operations in the Ordinary Course* [Docket No. 281] (the “Settlement Motion”). This Court approved the Settlement Motion on January 9, 2020 [Docket No. 339] (the “Settlement Order”).

7. In connection with the Settlement Order, an independent board of directors was constituted at the Debtor’s general partner, Strand Advisors, Inc., and certain operating protocols were instituted.

8. On July 16, 2020, this Court entered an order appointing James P. Seery, Jr., as the Debtor’s chief executive officer and chief restructuring officer [Docket No. 854].

9. The Debtor has continued in the possession of its property and has continued to operate and manage its business as a debtor-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. No trustee or examiner has been appointed in this chapter 11 case.

³ All docket numbers refer to the docket maintained by this Court.

B. Overview of HarbourVest's Claims

10. HarbourVest's claims against the Debtor's estate arise from its \$80 million investment in Highland CLO Funding, f/k/a Acis Loan Funding, Ltd. ("HCLOF"), pursuant to which HarbourVest obtained a 49 percent interest in HCLOF (the "Investment").

11. In brief, HarbourVest contends that it was fraudulently induced into entering into the Investment based on the Debtor's misrepresentations and omissions concerning certain material facts, including that the Debtor: (1) failed to disclose that it never intended to pay an arbitration award obtained by a former portfolio manager, (2) failed to disclose that it engaged in a series of fraudulent transfers for the purpose of preventing the former portfolio manager from collecting on his arbitration award and misrepresented the reasons changing the portfolio manager for HCLOF immediately prior to the Investment, (3) indicated that the dispute with the former portfolio manager would not impact investment activities, and (4) expressed confidence in the ability of HCLOF to reset or redeem the collateralized loan obligations ("CLOs") under its control.

12. HarbourVest seeks to rescind its Investment and claims damages in excess of \$300 million based on theories of fraud, fraudulent inducement, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of fiduciary duty (under Guernsey law), and on alleged violations of state securities laws and the Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization Act ("RICO").

13. HarbourVest's allegations are summarized below.⁴

⁴ Solely for purposes of this Motion, and not for any other reason, the facts set forth herein are adopted largely from the *HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No-Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 1057] (the "Response").

C. Summary of HarbourVest’s Factual Allegations

14. At the time HarbourVest made its Investment, the Debtor was embroiled in an arbitration against Joshua Terry (“Mr. Terry”), a former employee of the Debtor and limited partner of Acis Capital Management, L.P. (“Acis LP”). Through Acis LP, Mr. Terry managed Highland’s CLO business, including CLO-related investments held by Acis Loan Funding, Ltd. (“Acis Funding”).

15. The litigation between Mr. Terry and the Debtor began in 2016, after the Debtor terminated Mr. Terry and commenced an action against him in Texas state court. Mr. Terry asserted counterclaims for wrongful termination and for the wrongful taking of his ownership interest in Acis LP and subsequently had certain claims referred to arbitration where he obtained an award of approximately \$8 million (the “Arbitration Award”) on October 20, 2017.

16. HarbourVest alleges that the Debtor responded to the Arbitration Award by engaging in a series of fraudulent transfers and corporate restructurings, the true purposes of which were fraudulently concealed from HarbourVest.

17. For example, according to HarbourVest, the Debtor changed the name of the target fund from Acis Funding to “Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.” (“HCLOF”) and “swapped out” Acis LP for Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. as portfolio manager (the “Structural Changes”). The Debtor allegedly told HarbourVest that it made these changes because of the “reputational harm” to Acis LP resulting from the Arbitration Award. The Debtor further told HarbourVest that in lieu of redemptions, resetting the CLOs was necessary, and that it would be easier to reset them under the “Highland” CLO brand instead of the Acis CLO brand.

18. In addition, HarbourVest also alleges that the Debtor had no intention of allowing Mr. Terry to collect on his Arbitration Award, and orchestrated a scheme to “denude”

Acis of assets by fraudulently transferring virtually all of its assets and attempting to transfer its profitable portfolio management contracts to non-Acis, Debtor-related entities.

19. Unaware of the fraudulent transfers or the true purposes of the Structural Changes, and in reliance on representations made by the Debtor, HarbourVest closed on its Investment in HCLOF on November 15, 2017.

20. After discovering the transfers that occurred between Highland and Acis between October and December 2017 following the Arbitration Award (the “Transfers”), on January 24, 2018, Terry moved for a temporary restraining order (the “TRO”) from the Texas state court on the grounds that the Transfers were pursued for the purpose of rendering Acis LP judgment-proof. The state court granted the TRO, enjoining the Debtor from transferring any CLO management contracts or other assets away from Acis LP.

21. On January 30, 2018, Mr. Terry filed involuntary bankruptcy petitions against Acis LP and its general partner, Acis Capital Management GP, LLC. *See In re Acis Capital Management, L.P.*, Case No. 18-30264-sgj11 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2018) and *In re Acis Capital Management GP, LLC*, Case No. 18-30265-sgj11 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2018) (collectively, the “Acis Bankruptcy Case”). The Bankruptcy Court overruled the Debtor’s objection, granted the involuntary petitions, and appointed a chapter 11 trustee (the “Acis Trustee”). A long sequence of events subsequently transpired, all of which relate to HarbourVest’s claims, including:

- On May 31, 2018, the Court issued a *sua sponte* TRO preventing any actions in furtherance of the optional redemptions or other liquidation of the Acis CLOs.
- On June 14, 2018, HCLOF withdrew optional redemption notices.
- The TRO expired on June 15, 2018, and HCLOF noticed the Acis Trustee that it was requesting an optional redemption.

- HCLOF’s request was withdrawn on July 6, 2018, and on June 21, 2018, the Acis Trustee sought an injunction preventing Highland/HCLOF from seeking further redemptions (the “Preliminary Injunction”).
- The Court granted the Preliminary Injunction on July 10, 2018, pending the Acis Trustee’s attempts to confirm a plan or resolve the Acis Bankruptcy.
- On August 30, 2018, the Court denied confirmation of the First Amended Joint Plan for Acis, and held that the Preliminary Injunction must stay in place on the ground that the “evidence thus far has been compelling that numerous transfers after the Josh Terry judgment denuded Acis of value.”
- After the Debtor made various statements implicating HarbourVest in the Transfers, the Acis Trustee investigated HarbourVest’s involvement in such Transfers, including extensive discovery and taking a 30(b)(6) deposition of HarbourVest’s managing director, Michael Pugatch, on November 17, 2018.
- On March 20, 2019, HCLOF sent a letter to Acis LP stating that it was not interested in pursuing, or able to pursue, a CLO reset transaction.

D. The Parties’ Pleadings and Positions Concerning HarbourVest’s Proofs of Claim

22. On April 8, 2020, HarbourVest filed proofs of claim against Highland that were subsequently denoted by the Debtor’s claims agents as claim numbers 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154, respectively (collectively, the “Proofs of Claim”). Morris Dec. Exhibits 2-7.

23. The Proofs of Claim assert, among other things, that HarbourVest suffered significant harm due to conduct undertaken by the Debtor and the Debtor’s employees, including “financial harm resulting from (i) court orders in the Acis Bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise relegated the activity of HCLOF [*i.e.*, the Preliminary Injunction]; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis Bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF.” *See, e.g.*, Morris Dec. Exhibit 2 ¶3.

24. HarbourVest also asserted “any and all of its right to payment, remedies, and other claims (including contingent or unliquidated claims) against the Debtor in connection with and relating to the forgoing harm, including for any amounts due or owed under the various

agreements with the Debtor in connection with relating to” the Operative Documents “and any and all legal and equitable claims or causes of action relating to the forgoing harm.” *See, e.g.*, Morris Dec. Exhibit 2 ¶4.

25. Highland subsequently objected to HarbourVest’s Proofs of Claim on the grounds that they were no-liability claims. [Docket No. 906] (the “Claim Objection”).

26. On September 11, 2020, HarbourVest filed its Response. The Response articulated specified claims under U.S. federal and state and Guernsey law, including claims for fraud, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent inducement, fraudulent misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation (collectively, the “Fraud Claims”), U.S. State and Federal Securities Law Claims (the “Securities Claims”), violations of the Federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO”), breach of fiduciary duty and misuse of fund assets, and an unfair prejudice claim under Guernsey law (collectively, with the Proofs of Claim, the “HarbourVest Claims”).

27. On October 18, 2020, HarbourVest filed its *Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for Temporary Allowance of Claims for Purposes of Voting to Accept or Reject the Plan* [Docket No. 1207] (the “3018 Motion”). In its 3018 Motion, HarbourVest sought for its Claims to be temporarily allowed for voting purposes in the amount of more than \$300 million (based largely on a theory of treble damages).

E. Settlement Discussions

28. In October, the parties discussed the possibility of resolving the Rule 3018 Motion.

29. In November, the parties broadened the discussions in an attempt to reach a global resolution of the HarbourVest Claims. In the pursuit thereof, the parties and their

counsel participated in several conference calls where they engaged in a spirited exchange of perspectives concerning the facts and the law.

30. During follow up meetings, the parties' interests became more defined. Specifically, HarbourVest sought to maximize its recovery while fully extracting itself from the Investment, while the Debtor sought to minimize the HarbourVest Claims consistent with its perceptions of the facts and law.

31. After the parties' interests became more defined, the principals engaged in a series of direct, arm's-length, telephonic negotiations that ultimately lead to the settlement, whose terms are summarized below.

F. Summary of Settlement Terms

32. The Settlement Agreement contains the following material terms, among others:

- HarbourVest shall transfer its entire interest in HCLOF to an entity to be designated by the Debtor;⁵
- HarbourVest shall receive an allowed, general unsecured, non-priority claim in the amount of \$45 million and shall vote its Class 8 claim in that amount to support the Plan;
- HarbourVest shall receive a subordinated, allowed, general unsecured, non-priority claim in the amount of \$35 million and shall vote its Class 9 claim in that amount to support the Plan;
- HarbourVest will support confirmation of the Debtor's Plan, including, but not limited to, voting its claims in support of the Plan;
- The HarbourVest Claims shall be allowed in the aggregate amount of \$45 million for voting purposes;
- HarbourVest will support the Debtor's pursuit of its pending Plan of Reorganization; and
- The parties shall exchange mutual releases.

⁵ The NAV for HarbourVest's 49.98% interest in HCLOF was estimated to be approximately \$22 million as of December 1, 2020.

See generally Morris Dec. Exhibit 1.

BASIS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED

33. Bankruptcy Rule 9019 governs the procedural prerequisites to approval of a settlement, providing that:

On motion by the trustee and after notice and a hearing, the court may approve a compromise or settlement. Notice shall be given to creditors, the United States trustee, the debtor, and indenture trustees as provided in Rule 2002 and to any other entity as the court may direct.

FED. R. BANKR. P. 9019(a).

34. Settlements in bankruptcy are favored as a means of minimizing litigation, expediting the administration of the bankruptcy estate, and providing for the efficient resolution of bankruptcy cases. *See Myers v. Martin (In re Martin)*, 91 F.3d 389, 393 (3d Cir. 1996); *Rivercity v. Herpel (In re Jackson Brewing Co.)*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980). Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a), a bankruptcy court may approve a compromise or settlement as long as the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interest of the estate. *See In re Age Ref. Inc.*, 801 F.3d 530, 540 (5th Cir. 2015). Ultimately, “approval of a compromise is within the sound discretion of the bankruptcy court.” *See United States v. AWECO, Inc. (In re AWECO, Inc.)*, 725 F.2d 293, 297 (5th Cir. 1984); *Jackson Brewing*, 624 F.2d at 602–03.

35. In making this determination, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit applies a three-part test, “with a focus on comparing ‘the terms of the compromise with the rewards of litigation.’” *Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors v. Cajun Elec. Power Coop. (In re Cajun Elec. Power Coop.)*, 119 F.3d 349, 356 (5th Cir. 1997) (citing *Jackson Brewing*, 624 F.2d at 602). The Fifth Circuit has instructed courts to consider the following factors: “(1) The probability of success in the litigation, with due consideration for the uncertainty of law and fact, (2) The complexity and likely duration of the litigation and any

attendant expense, inconvenience and delay, and (3) All other factors bearing on the wisdom of the compromise.” *Id.* Under the rubric of the third factor referenced above, the Fifth Circuit has specified two additional factors that bear on the decision to approve a proposed settlement. First, the court should consider “the paramount interest of creditors with proper deference to their reasonable views.” *Id.*; *Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co. v. United Cos. Fin. Corp. (In re Foster Mortgage Corp.)*, 68 F.3d 914, 917 (5th Cir. 1995). Second, the court should consider the “extent to which the settlement is truly the product of arms-length bargaining, and not of fraud or collusion.” *Age Ref. Inc.*, 801 F.3d at 540; *Foster Mortgage Corp.*, 68 F.3d at 918 (citations omitted).

36. There is ample basis to approve the proposed Settlement Agreement based on the Rule 9019 factors set forth by the Fifth Circuit.

37. First, although the Debtor believes that it has valid defenses to the HarbourVest Claims, there is no guarantee that the Debtor would succeed in its litigation with HarbourVest. Indeed, to establish its defenses, the Debtor would be required to rely, at least in part, on the credibility of witnesses whose veracity has already been called into question by this Court. Moreover, it will be difficult to dispute that the Transfers precipitated the Acis Bankruptcy, and, ultimately, the imposition of the Bankruptcy Court’s TRO that restricted HCLOF’s ability to reset or redeem the CLOs and that is at the core of the HarbourVest Claims.

38. The second factor—the complexity, duration, and costs of litigation—also weighs heavily in favor of approving the Settlement Agreement. As this Court is aware, the events forming the basis of the HarbourVest Claims—including the Terry Litigation and Acis Bankruptcy—proceeded *for years* in this Court and in multiple other forums, and has already cost the Debtor’s estate millions of dollars in legal fees. If the Settlement Agreement is not approved, then the parties will expend significant resources litigating a host of fact-intensive

issues including, among other things, the substance and materiality of the Debtor's alleged fraudulent statements and omissions and whether HarbourVest reasonably relied on those statements and omissions.

39. Third, approval of the Settlement Agreement is justified by the paramount interest of creditors. Specifically, the settlement will enable the Debtor to: (a) avoid incurring substantial litigation costs; (b) avoid the litigation risk associated with HarbourVest's \$300 million claim; and (c) through the plan support provisions, increase the likelihood that the Debtor's pending plan of reorganization will be confirmed.

40. Finally, the Settlement Agreement was unquestionably negotiated at arm's-length. The terms of the settlement are the result of numerous, ongoing discussions and negotiations between the parties and their counsel and represent neither party's "best case scenario." Indeed, the Settlement Agreement should be approved as a rational exercise of the Debtor's business judgment made after due deliberation of the facts and circumstances concerning HarbourVest's Claims.

NO PRIOR REQUEST

41. No previous request for the relief sought herein has been made to this, or any other, Court.

NOTICE

42. Notice of this Motion shall be given to the following parties or, in lieu thereof, to their counsel, if known: (a) counsel for HarbourVest; (b) the Office of the United States Trustee; (c) the Office of the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Texas; (d) the Debtor's principal secured parties; (e) counsel to the Committee; and (f) parties requesting notice pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2002. The Debtor submits that, in light of the nature of the relief requested, no other or further notice need be given.

WHEREFORE, the Debtor respectfully requests entry of an order, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, (a) granting the relief requested herein, and (b) granting such other relief as is just and proper.

Dated: December 23, 2020.

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No. 143717)
Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084)
John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 266326)
Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992)
Hayley R. Winograd (NY Bar No. 5612569)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
Facsimile: (310) 201-0760
Email: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
ikharasch@pszjlaw.com
jmorris@pszjlaw.com
gdemo@pszjlaw.com
hwinograd@pszjlaw.com

-and-

HAYWARD & ASSOCIATES PLLC

/s/ Zachery Z. Annable

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for the Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession

EXHIBIT 3

EXECUTION VERSION

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (the “Agreement”) is entered into as of December 23, 2020, between Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”), on the one hand, and HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (each, a “HarbourVest Party,” and collectively, “HarbourVest”), on the other hand. Each of the foregoing are sometimes referred to herein collectively as the “Parties” and individually as a “Party.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Case”) in the Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 19-12239 (CSS) (the “Delaware Bankruptcy Court”);

WHEREAS, on December 4, 2019, the Delaware Bankruptcy Court entered an order transferring venue of the Debtor’s case to the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Case No. 19-34054-sgj (the “Bankruptcy Court”);

WHEREAS, prior to the Petition Date, HarbourVest invested in Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. f/k/a Acis Loan Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”) and acquired an a 49.98% ownership interest in HCLOF (the “HarbourVest Interests”);

WHEREAS, the portfolio manager for HCLOF is Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd., a subsidiary of the Debtor;

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2020, HarbourVest filed proofs of claim in the Bankruptcy Case, which are listed on the Debtor’s claims register as claim numbers 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154 (the “HarbourVest Claims”), asserting claims against the Debtor relating to its investment in HCLOF;

WHEREAS, on July 30, 2020, the Debtor filed the *Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Certain (a) Duplicate Claims; (b) Overstated Claims; (c) Late-Filed Claims; (d) Satisfied Claims; (e) No Liability Claims; and (f) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 906], in which the Debtor objected to the HarbourVest Claims;

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2020, HarbourVest filed the *HarbourVest Response to Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Creation (a) Duplicate Claims; (b) Overstated Claims; (c) Late-Filed Claims; (d) Satisfied Claims; (e) No Liability Claims; and (f) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 1057] (the “HarbourVest Response”);

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2020, HarbourVest filed the *Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for Temporary Allowance of Claims for Purposes of Voting to Accept or Reject the Plan* [Docket No. 1207] (the “3018 Motion” and together with the HarbourVest Response, the “HarbourVest Pleadings”);

EXECUTION VERSION

WHEREAS, in the HarbourVest Pleadings, HarbourVest asserted, among other things, that the HarbourVest Claims included claims against the Debtor arising from fraudulent inducement, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of securities laws, and misuse of assets and sought damages in excess of \$300,000,000;

WHEREAS, the Debtor disputes the HarbourVest Claims;

WHEREAS, on November 24, 2020, the Debtor filed the *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization for Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1472] (as amended, the “Plan”).¹

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to enter into this Agreement which incorporates, formalizes, and finalizes the full and final resolution of the HarbourVest Claims and HarbourVest Pleadings; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement will be presented to the Bankruptcy Court for approval pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 (“Rule 9019”).

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, the covenants, conditions, and promises made herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the Parties agree as follows:

1. **Settlement of Claims.**

(a) In full and complete satisfaction of the HarbourVest Claims, HarbourVest will receive:

(i) an allowed, nonpriority general unsecured claim in the aggregate amount of \$45,000,000 (the “Allowed GUC Claim”); and

(ii) an allowed subordinated claim in the aggregate amount of \$35,000,000 (the “Allowed Subordinated Claim” and together with the Allowed GUC Claim, the “Allowed Claims”).

(b) On the Effective Date, HarbourVest will transfer all of its rights, title, and interest in the HarbourVest Interests to the Debtor or its nominee pursuant to the terms of the *Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.*, attached hereto as Exhibit A (the “Transfer Agreements”) and the Debtor or its nominee will become a shareholder of HCLOF with respect to the HarbourVest Interests. The terms of the Transfer Agreements are incorporated into this Agreement by reference.

2. **Releases.**

(a) Upon the Effective Date, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, each HarbourVest Party on behalf of itself and each of its current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents,

¹ All capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings given to them in the Plan.

EXECUTION VERSION

participants, subsidiaries, parents, successors, designees, and assigns hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue, the Debtor, HCLOF, HCLOF's current and former directors, and the Debtor's current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns, except as expressly set forth below (the "Debtor Released Parties"), for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney's fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including, without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether known or unknown, including, without limitation, those which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the "HarbourVest Released Claims").

(b) Upon the Effective Date, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Debtor hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue (i) each HarbourVest Party and (ii) each HarbourVest Party's current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns (the "HarbourVest Released Parties"), for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney's fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including, without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether known or unknown, which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the "Debtor Released Claims"); *provided, however*, that notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the release contained in this Section 2(b) will apply to the HarbourVest Released Parties set forth in subsection (b)(ii) only with respect to Debtor Released Claims arising from or relating to HarbourVest's ownership of the HarbourVest Interests.

(c) Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, the releases set forth herein will not apply with respect to (i) the Allowed Claims, (ii) the claims of Charlotte Investor IV, L.P., or (iii) the duties, rights, or obligations of any Party under this Agreement or the Transfer Agreements.

3. **Agreement Subject to Bankruptcy Court Approval.** The effectiveness of this Agreement and the Parties' obligations hereunder are conditioned in all respects on the approval of this Agreement by the Bankruptcy Court. The Parties agree to cooperate and use reasonable efforts to have this Agreement approved by the Bankruptcy Court. The "Effective Date" will be the date of an order entered by the Bankruptcy Court approving this Agreement pursuant to a motion filed under Rule 9019.

EXECUTION VERSION

4. **Representations and Warranties.** Subject in all respects to Section 3 hereof:

(a) each HarbourVest Party represents and warrants that (i) it has full authority to enter into this Agreement and to release the HarbourVest Released Claims and has not sold, transferred, or assigned any HarbourVest Released Claim to any other person or entity, (ii) no person or entity other than such HarbourVest Party has been, is, or will be authorized to bring, pursue, or enforce any HarbourVest Released Claim on behalf of, for the benefit of, or in the name of (whether directly or derivatively) of such HarbourVest Party; and (iii) HarbourVest owns all of the HCLOF Interests free and clear of any claims or interests; and

(b) the Debtor represents and warrants to HarbourVest that (i) it has full authority to enter into this Agreement and to release the Debtor Released Claims and (ii) no person or entity other than the Debtor has been, is, or will be authorized to bring, pursue, or enforce any Debtor Released Claim on behalf of, for the benefit of, or in the name of (whether directly or derivatively) of the Debtor Party.

5. **Plan Support.**

(a) Each HarbourVest Party hereby agrees that it will (a) vote all HarbourVest Claims held by such HarbourVest Party to accept the Plan, by delivering its duly executed and completed ballots accepting the Plan on a timely basis; and (b) not (i) change, withdraw, or revoke such vote (or cause or direct such vote to be changed withdrawn or revoked); (ii) exercise any right or remedy for the enforcement, collection, or recovery of any claim against the Debtor except in a manner consistent with this Agreement or the Plan, (iii) object to, impede, or take any action other action to interfere with, delay or postpone acceptance or confirmation of the Plan; (iv) directly or indirectly solicit, propose, file, support, participate in the formulation of or vote for, any restructuring, sale of assets (including pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 363), merger, workout, or plan of reorganization of the Debtor other than the Plan; or (v) otherwise take any action that would in any material respect interfere with, delay, or postpone the consummation of the Plan; provided, however, that such vote may be revoked (and, upon such revocation, deemed void ab initio) by such HarbourVest Party at any time following the termination of this agreement or the occurrence of a Support Termination Event (it being understood that any termination of this agreement shall entitle each HarbourVest Party to change its vote in accordance with section 1127(d) of the Bankruptcy Code), notwithstanding any voting deadline established by the Bankruptcy Court including without limitation the January 5, 2021, 5:00 p.m. (prevailing Central Time) deadline established by the *Order Approving Form of Ballots, Voting Deadline and Solicitation Procedures* [Docket No. 1476].

(b) In full resolution of the 3018 Motion, HarbourVest will have a general unsecured claim for voting purposes only in the amount of \$45,000,000.

(c) The obligations of the HarbourVest Parties under this Section 5 shall automatically terminate upon the occurrence of any of the following (each a “Support Termination Event”): (i) the effective date of the Plan, (ii) the withdrawal of the Plan, (iii) the entry of an order by the Bankruptcy Court (A) converting the Bankruptcy Case to a case under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code or (B) appointing an examiner with expanded powers beyond those set forth in sections 1106(a)(3) and (4) of the Bankruptcy Code or a trustee in Bankruptcy

EXECUTION VERSION

Case, or (iv) the failure of the Court to enter an order approving the terms of this Agreement and the settlement described herein pursuant to Rule 9019 prior to confirmation of the Plan.

6. **No Admission of Liability.** The Parties acknowledge that there is a bona fide dispute with respect to the HarbourVest Claims. Nothing in this Agreement will imply, an admission of liability, fault or wrongdoing by the Debtor, HarbourVest, or any other person, and the execution of this Agreement does not constitute an admission of liability, fault, or wrongdoing on the part of the Debtor, HarbourVest, or any other person.

7. **Successors-in-Interest.** This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of each of the Parties and their successors, and assigns.

8. **Notice.** Each notice and other communication hereunder will be in writing and will be sent by email and delivered or mailed by registered mail, receipt requested, and will be deemed to have been given on the date of its delivery, if delivered, and on the fifth full business day following the date of the mailing, if mailed to each of the Parties thereto at the following respective addresses or such other address as may be specified in any notice delivered or mailed as set forth below:

HARBOURVEST

HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Attention: Michael J. Pugatch
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Telephone No. 617-348-3712
E-mail: mpugatch@harbourvest.com

with a copy (which shall not constitute notice) to:

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
Attention: M. Natasha Labovitz, Esq.
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone No. 212-909-6649
E-mail: nlabovitz@debevoise.com

THE DEBTOR

Highland Capital Management, L.P.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Attention: James P. Seery, Jr.
Telephone No.: 972-628-4100
Facsimile No.: 972-628-4147
E-mail: jpseeryjr@gmail.com

EXECUTION VERSION

with a copy (which shall not constitute notice) to:

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
Attention: Jeffrey Pomerantz, Esq.
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone No.: 310-277-6910
Facsimile No.: 310-201-0760
E-mail: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com

9. **Advice of Counsel.** Each Party represents that it has: (a) been adequately represented by independent legal counsel of its own choice, throughout all of the negotiations that preceded the execution of this Agreement; (b) executed this Agreement upon the advice of such counsel; (c) read this Agreement, and understands and assents to all the terms and conditions contained herein without any reservations; and (d) had the opportunity to have this Agreement and all the terms and conditions contained herein explained by independent counsel, who has answered any and all questions asked of such counsel, or which could have been asked of such counsel, including, but not limited to, with regard to the meaning and effect of any of the provisions of this Agreement.

10. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement and the Transfer Agreement contain the entire agreement and understanding concerning the subject matter of this Agreement, and supersede and replace all prior negotiations and agreements, written or oral and executed or unexecuted, concerning such subject matter. Each of the Parties acknowledges that no other Party, nor any agent of or attorney for any such Party, has made any promise, representation or warranty, express or implied, written or oral, not otherwise contained in this Agreement to induce any Party to execute this Agreement. The Parties further acknowledge that they are not executing this Agreement in reliance on any promise, representation or warranty not contained in this Agreement, and that any such reliance would be unreasonable. This Agreement will not be waived or modified except by an agreement in writing signed by each Party or duly authorized representative of each Party.

11. **No Party Deemed Drafter.** The Parties acknowledge that the terms of this Agreement are contractual and are the result of arms'-length negotiations between the Parties and their chosen counsel. Each Party and its counsel cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. In any construction to be made of this Agreement, the Agreement will not be construed against any Party.

12. **Future Cooperation.** The Parties agree to cooperate and execute such further documentation as is reasonably necessary to effectuate the intent of this Agreement.

13. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in counterparts with the same force and effect as if executed in one complete document. Each Party's signature hereto will signify acceptance of, and agreement to, the terms and provisions contained in this Agreement. Photographic, electronic, and facsimile copies of signed counterparts may be used in lieu of the originals of this Agreement for any purpose.

EXECUTION VERSION

14. **Governing Law; Venue; Attorneys' Fees and Costs.** The Parties agree that this Agreement will be governed by and will be construed according to the laws of the State of Texas without regard to conflict-of-law principles. Each of the Parties hereby submits to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court during the pendency of the Bankruptcy Case and thereafter to the exclusive jurisdiction of the state and federal courts located in the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, with respect to any disputes arising from or out of this Agreement. In any action to enforce this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees and costs (including experts).

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

EXECUTION VERSION

IT IS HEREBY AGREED.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

By: /s/ James P. Seery, Jr.
Name: James P. Seery, Jr.
Its: CEO/CRO

HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., by HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P., its General Partner, by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Managing Member

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited, its Alternative Investment Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest Partners L.P., on behalf of funds and accounts under management, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

EXECUTION VERSION

**HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited, its
Alternative Investment Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed
Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner**

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

**HV International VIII Secondary L.P., by HIPEP VIII Associates L.P., its General
Partner, by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC,
its Managing Member**

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

Exhibit A

TRANSFER AGREEMENT
FOR ORDINARY SHARES OF
HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD.

This Transfer Agreement, dated as of December [REDACTED], 2020 (this “**Transfer Agreement**”), is entered into by and among Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (the “**Fund**”), Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. (the “**Portfolio Manager**”), HCMLP Investments, LLC (the “**Transferee**”) and each of the following: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., and HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. (collectively, the “**Transferors**”).

WHEREAS, each Transferor is the record, legal and beneficial owner of the number of ordinary shares (“**Shares**”) of the Fund set forth opposite such Transferor’s name on Exhibit A hereto (with respect to each Transferor, the “**Transferred Shares**”).

WHEREAS the Transferee is an affiliate and wholly owned subsidiary of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“**HCMLP**”) which is one of the initial members of the Fund.

WHEREAS, each Transferor wishes to transfer and assign 100% of its rights, title and interest as a shareholder in the Fund, including the Transferred Shares (the “**Interest**”) on the terms set forth in this Transfer Agreement.

WHEREAS, subject to and in connection with the approval of that certain Settlement Agreement, dated on or about the date hereof, by and among HCMLP and the Transferors (the “**Settlement Agreement**”), the Transferee desires that the Interest be transferred to Transferee and that thereafter the Transferee will become a Shareholder and the Transferors will no longer be Shareholders.

WHEREAS, the Portfolio Manager desires to consent to such transfers and to the admission of Transferee as a Shareholder on the terms set forth herein, and the Transferors and Transferee agree to such terms.

WHEREAS, the Fund desires to amend its records to reflect the foregoing transfers.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Transfer of Shares and Advisory Board

- a. Each Transferor hereby transfers and assigns all of its rights, title, and interest in its Interest to the Transferee, and the Transferee wishes to be admitted to the Fund as a Shareholder.
- b. In connection with the transfer of the Interest as contemplated herein, the Transferee shall be granted the right to appoint a representative to the Fund’s advisory board (the “**Advisory Board**”) to replace the Transferors’ appointed representative to the Advisory Board.

- c. Transferee hereby assumes all of Transferor's rights and obligations in respect of the Interest effective as of the Effective Date (as defined below) and acknowledge that thereafter Transferee shall be subject to the applicable terms and provisions of the Members' Agreement dated as of November 15, 2017 (the "**Members' Agreement**"), the Articles of Incorporation adopted November 15, 2017 (the "**Articles**") and the Subscription and transfer Agreement, dated as of November 15, 2017 among each Transferor, the Fund and the Portfolio Manager (the "**Subscription Agreement**", and together with the Members' Agreement and the Articles, the "**Fund Agreements**") with respect to the Interest. Transferee does not assume any liability or responsibility for any obligations or liabilities incurred by any Transferor prior to the Effective Date of the transfer.
 - d. Following the transfer, each Transferor shall have no further rights or obligations to any party hereunder in respect of the Interest under the Fund Agreements.
 - e. This Transfer Agreement, and the parties' obligations hereunder, are conditioned in all respects on the approval by the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 of (i) this Transfer Agreement and (ii) the Settlement Agreement, and each of the parties agree that no further action shall be required from any party for the transfer of the Interest to be effective except as described herein.
2. Transferee's Representations and Warranties. The Transferee represents and warrants to the Transferors, the Portfolio Manager, and the Fund as follows:
- a. This Transfer Agreement constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the Transferee, enforceable against it in accordance with its terms;
 - b. This Transfer Agreement has been duly and validly executed and delivered by or on behalf of the Transferee and such execution and delivery have been duly authorized by all necessary trust action of the Transferee;
 - c. The Transferee acknowledges receipt of, has read, and is familiar with, the Fund's Offering Memorandum for Placing Shares dated November 15, 2017 (the "**Offering Memorandum**") and the Fund Agreements;
 - d. The Transferee hereby accepts and receives the Interest from the Transferors for investment, and not with a view to the sale or distribution of any part thereof, and the Transferee has no present intention of selling, granting participations in, or otherwise distributing the same, but subject nevertheless to any requirement of law that the disposition of the Transferee's property shall at all times be within such Transferee's control; and
 - e. The Transferee is an "Eligible U.S. Investor" as defined in the Offering Memorandum.

3. Transferors' Representations and Warranties. Each Transferor represents and warrants to the Transferee, the Portfolio Manager, and the Fund as follows:
 - a. This Transfer Agreement constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the Transferor, enforceable against it in accordance with its terms;
 - b. This Transfer Agreement has been duly authorized, and duly and validly executed and delivered by the Transferor and such execution and delivery have been duly authorized by all necessary action of the Transferor; and
 - c. As of the date hereof, the Transferor has good and valid title to the Transferor's Interest, free and clear of any liens, vesting requirements or claims by others.
4. Consent to Transfer. Based in part on the representations and warranties of the Transferors and the Transferee which are included herein, and on the terms contained herein, the Portfolio Manager and the Fund hereby consent to the transfers of the Interest, the admission of the Transferee as a Shareholder and the Transferee's appointment of a representative to the Advisory Board, the Portfolio Manager's execution of this Transfer Agreement constituting its prior written consent to the transfers of the Interest for the purposes of article 18.1 of the Articles and this Transfer Agreement constituting express notice in writing to the Fund of the assignment set out at clause 1(c) above for the purposes of the Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 1979 (as amended).
5. Completion: As of the date of approval by the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 of (i) this Transfer Agreement and (ii) the Settlement Agreement (the "**Effective Date**"):
 - a. each Transferor shall deliver or cause to be delivered to the Transferee a transfer instrument relating to the Transferred Shares duly executed and completed by that Transferor in favor of the Transferee; and
 - b. the Transferee shall deliver to the Transferors and the Fund a duly executed and dated Adherence Agreement (as defined in the Members' Agreement).

Prior to the Effective Date the Transferee shall procure that:

 - c. the board of directors of the Fund shall hold a meeting at which the transfer of the Shares to the Transferee shall be approved and registration in the register of members of the Fund shall be effected on the Effective Date.
6. Miscellaneous.
 - a. Each of the parties hereto agree to execute any further instruments and perform any further acts which are or may become reasonably necessary to carry out the intent of this Transfer Agreement or are reasonably requested by the Portfolio Manager, the Fund or a Transferor to complete the transfer of the Interest.

- b. The parties to this Transfer Agreement acknowledge that the terms of this Transfer Agreement are the result of arms'-length negotiations between the parties and their respective counsel. Each party and its counsel cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Transfer Agreement. In any construction to be made of this Transfer Agreement, the language or drafting of this Transfer Agreement will not be construed against any party.
- c. This Transfer Agreement shall be governed by, and construed and enforced in accordance with, the internal substantive laws of the state of Delaware, without giving effect to conflicts of law principles.
- d. The representations, warranties and covenants of the Transferors and the Transferee shall remain in full force and effect following the transfer of the Interest, and the Fund and the Portfolio Manager thereafter may rely on all such representations, warranties and covenants.
- e. This Transfer Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Photographic, electronic, and facsimile copies of signed counterparts may be used in lieu of the originals of this Transfer Agreement for any purpose.
- f. Captions of sections have been added only for convenience and shall not be deemed to be a part of this Transfer Agreement.
- g. This Transfer Agreement is among the parties hereto. No Person that is not a party hereto shall have any right herein as a third-party beneficiary or otherwise except as expressly contemplated hereby.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

[Additional Signatures on Following Page]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have executed this Transfer Agreement as of the date first above written.

TRANSFERORS:

HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HV International VIII Secondary L.P.

By: HIPEP VIII Associates L.P.
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its Managing Member

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited
Its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its General Partner

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited
Its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its General Partner

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.

By: HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P.
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its Managing Member

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

Exhibit A

<u>Transferee Name</u>	<u>Number of Shares</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HV International VIII Secondary L.P.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

EXHIBIT 4

D. Michael Lynn
State Bar I.D. No. 12736500
John Y. Bonds, III
State Bar I.D. No. 02589100
John T. Wilson, IV
State Bar I.D. No. 24033344
Bryan C. Assink
State Bar I.D. No. 24089009
BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFFER JONES LLP
420 Throckmorton Street, Suite 1000
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 405-6900 telephone
(817) 405-6902 facsimile

ATTORNEYS FOR JAMES DONDERO

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

IN RE:	§	
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,	§	Case No. 19-34054
L.P.,	§	
	§	
Debtor.	§	Chapter 11

**JAMES DONDERO'S OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ENTRY
OF AN ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT WITH HARBOURVEST**
[Relates to Docket No. 1625]

James Dondero ("Respondent"), a creditor, indirect equity security holder, and party in interest in the above-captioned bankruptcy case, hereby files this Objection to *Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154)* [Docket No. 1625] (the "Motion") filed by Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the "Debtor"). Through the Motion, the Debtor seeks approval of its compromise with HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (collectively, "HarbourVest") pursuant to Rule 9019 of the Federal



Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”). In support of this objection, Respondent respectfully represents as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Under Bankruptcy Rule 9019, the Bankruptcy Court is tasked with making an independent judgment on the merits of a proposed settlement to ensure that the proposed settlement is “fair, equitable, and in the best interest of the estate.”¹ While Respondent recognizes the Debtor’s efforts in arranging a settlement, there are at least three significant issues with the terms of the settlement that merit denial of the Motion: (i) the proposed settlement is not reasonable or in the best interest of the estate given the weakness of the HarbourVest Claim (as hereinafter defined); (ii) the proposed settlement is a blatant attempt to purchase votes in support of Debtor’s plan by giving HarbourVest a significant claim to which it would not otherwise be entitled; and (iii) the proposed settlement seeks to improperly classify the HarbourVest Claim² in two separate classes in order to gerrymander an affirmative vote on its reorganization plan. Moreover, the proposed settlement does not satisfy the factors for approval fixed by case law. On information and belief, Debtor’s CEO/CRO, Mr. Seery, has previously asserted on multiple occasions that the HarbourVest Claim had no value and that the Debtor could resolve such claim for no more than \$5 million. While Respondent and Mr. Seery have had a number of disagreements in this case, Respondent agrees with Mr. Seery’s initial conclusion that the HarbourVest Claim is substantially without merit. Respondent understands that any settlement will not necessarily provide the best possible outcome for the Debtor, but in this instance the proposed settlement far exceeds the bounds of reasonableness and, on its face, is an attempt by the Debtor to purchase votes in favor

¹ See *In re Jackson Brewing Co.*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980).

² While HarbourVest has filed a number of claims, each filed claim is exactly the same except in the name of the claimant. See Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154.

of confirmation of its Plan. Given the Debtor's prior positions as to the merits of HarbourVest Claim it is necessary for the Court to closely scrutinize the settlement to determine why the Debtor now believes granting HarbourVest a net claim of nearly \$60 million³ resulting from HarbourVest's investment in a non-debtor entity (which was and is managed by a non-debtor) to be in the best interest of the estate. Upon close scrutiny, Respondent believes the Court will find that the proposed settlement is not reasonable or in the best interest of the estate and the Motion therefore should be denied.

II. BACKGROUND

2. On October 16, 2019 (the "Petition Date"), the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code") in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 19-12239 (CSS) (the "Delaware Court").

3. On October 29, 2019, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee") was appointed by the U.S. Trustee in Delaware.

4. On December 4, 2019, the Delaware Court entered an order transferring venue of the Debtor's Bankruptcy Case to this Court [Docket No. 186].

5. On December 27, 2019, the Debtor filed that certain *Motion of the Debtor for Approval of Settlement with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Regarding Governance of the Debtor and Procedures for Operations in the Ordinary Course* [Docket No. 281] (the "Settlement Motion"). This Court approved the Settlement Motion on January 9, 2020 [Docket No. 339] (the "Settlement Order").

³ The proposed settlement provides that HarbourVest shall receive an allowed general unsecured (Class 8) claim in the amount of \$45 million and an allowed subordinated general unsecured (Class 9) claim in the amount of \$35 million. As part of the settlement, HarbourVest will then transfer its entire interest in Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. ("HCLOF") to an entity to be designated by the Debtor. The Debtor states that the value of this interest is approximately \$22 million as of December 1, 2020.

6. In connection with the Settlement Order, an independent board of directors was appointed on January 9, 2020, for the Debtor's general partner, Strand Advisors, Inc. (the "Board"). The members of the Board are James P. Seery, Jr., John S. Dubel, and Russell F. Nelms.

7. On July 16, 2020, this Court entered an order authorizing the Debtor to employ James P. Seery, Jr. as Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer of the Debtor. *See* Docket No. 854.

8. On April 8, 2020, HarbourVest filed Proofs of Claim Numbers 143, 149, 149, 150, 153, and 154 (collectively, the "HarbourVest Claim")⁴.

9. On July 30, 2020, the Debtor filed *Debtor's First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 906] (the "Debtor Objection"), which contained an objection to the HarbourVest Claim.

10. On September 11, 2020, HarbourVest filed *HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 1057] (the "HarbourVest Response").

11. On December 23, 2020, the Debtor filed the Motion seeking approval of a proposed settlement of the HarbourVest Claim under Rule 9019. Docket No. 1625.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

12. The merits of a proposed compromise should be judged under the criteria set forth in *Protective Comm. for Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414 (1968). *TMT Trailer* requires that a compromise must be "fair and equitable." *TMT Trailer*, 390

⁴ While HarbourVest has filed a number of claims, each filed claim is exactly the same except in the name of the claimant. *See* Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154.

U.S. at 424; *In re AWECO, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 293, 298 (5th Cir. 1984). The terms “fair and equitable,” commonly referred to as the “absolute priority rule,” mean that (i) senior interests are entitled to full priority over junior interests; and (ii) the compromise is reasonable in relation to the likely rewards of litigation. *In re Cajun Electric Power Coop.*, 119 F.3d 349, 355 (5th Cir. 1997); *In re Jackson Brewing Co.*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980).

13. In determining whether a proposed compromise is fair and equitable, a Court should consider the following factors:

- (i) the probabilities of ultimate success should the claim be litigated;
- (ii) the complexity, expense, and likely duration of litigating the claim;
- (iii) the difficulties of collecting a judgment rendered from such litigation; and,
- (iv) all other factors relevant to a full and fair assessment of the wisdom of the compromise.

TMT Trailer, 390 U.S. at 424.

14. In considering whether to approve a proposed compromise, the bankruptcy judge “may not simply accept the trustee’s word that the settlement is reasonable, nor may he merely ‘rubber stamp’ the trustee’s proposal.” *In re Am. Res. Corp.*, 841 F.2d 159, 162 (7th Cir. 1987). “[T]he bankruptcy judge must apprise himself of all facts necessary to evaluate the settlement and make an informed and independent judgment about the settlement.” *See TMT Trailer*, 390 U.S. at 424, 434.

15. While the trustee’s business judgment is entitled to a certain deference, “business judgment is not alone determinative of the issue of court approval.” *See In re Endoscopy Ctr. of S. Nev., LLC*, 451 B.R. 527, 536 (Bankr. D. Nev. 2011). Further, the business judgment rule does not provide a debtor with “unfettered freedom” to do as it wishes. *See In re Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.*, 403 B.R. 413, 426 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2009) (“[A]s a fiduciary holding its estate in trust and responsible

to the court, a debtor in possession must administer its case and conduct its business in a fashion amenable to the scrutiny to be expected from creditor and court oversight.”). The Court must conduct an “intelligent, objective and educated evaluation”⁵ of the proposed settlement “to ensure that the settlement is fair, equitable, and in the best interest of the estate and creditors.” *See In re Mirant Corp.*, 348 B.R. 725, 739 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2006) (quoting *Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co. v. Foster Mortgage Corp. (In re Foster Mortgage Corp.)*, 68 F.3d 914, 917 (5th Cir. 1995)).

IV. ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITIES

16. As discussed in detail below, there are three significant issues with the terms of the settlement that merit denial of the Motion: (i) the proposed settlement is not reasonable or in the best interest of the estate given the weakness of the HarbourVest Claim; (ii) the proposed settlement is a blatant attempt to purchase votes in support of Debtor’s plan by giving HarbourVest a substantial claim to which it is not entitled; and (iii) the proposed settlement seeks to improperly classify HarbourVest’s one claim in two separate classes in order to gerrymander an affirmative vote on its reorganization plan. For these and certain additional reasons as discussed below, the Motion should be denied.

A. Through its Claim, HarbourVest Seeks to Revisit this Court’s Orders in the Acis Case

17. As an initial matter, through its proofs of claim, HarbourVest appears to be second guessing the Court’s judgment in the Chapter 11 case of Acis Capital Management, LP and Acis Capital Management GP, LLC (collectively, “Acis”) and seeking to revisit the Court’s orders entered in that case years ago. HarbourVest appears to be arguing that the TRO and injunction

⁵ *In re Jackson Brewing Co.*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980) (“To assure a proper compromise the bankruptcy judge, must be apprised of all the necessary facts for an intelligent, objective and educated evaluation. He must compare the terms of the compromise with the likely rewards of litigation.”).

entered in the Acis case that prevented redemptions or resets in the CLOs are now the root cause of the decrease in value of its investment in HCLOF.

18. Specifically, the claim states that HarbourVest incurred “financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF.”⁶

19. Essentially, HarbourVest is saying that the orders entered in the Acis case did not actually protect the investors and their investments, but instead were a triggering cause for the alleged diminution in value of its investment in HCLOF. Nevertheless, even though the value of HCLOF dropped dramatically only after the Effective Date of Acis’s Plan, years later and despite the lack of Debtor involvement in managing HarbourVest’s investment, HarbourVest now seeks to impute liability to the Debtor through a flimsy narrative designed to recoup investment losses unrelated to the Debtor and for which the Debtor owed HarbourVest no duty.

20. That HarbourVest now, years later, seeks to revisit this Court’s Acis orders raises a number of issues, including those as to HarbourVest’s involvement (or lack thereof) in the Acis case, whether the orders, Plan, or Confirmation Order in the Acis case may bar some of the relief requested by HarbourVest here, and questions related to the merits of the HarbourVest Claim and the legal grounds allegedly supporting it.

⁶ See Proof of Claim 143, para. 3 (“Due to the Acis bankruptcy and certain conduct alleged to have been undertaken by the Debtor (to whom Acis subcontracted its functions) and Debtor’s employees (who were officers, employees, and agents of Acis), the Claimant has suffered significant harm. Such harm includes, but is not limited to, financial harm resulting from, among other things (i) court orders in the Acis bankruptcy that prevented certain CLOs in which HCLOF was invested from being refinanced or reset and court orders that otherwise regulated the activity of HCLOF; and (ii) significant fees and expenses related to the Acis bankruptcy that were charged to HCLOF.”).

B. The HarbourVest Claim Lacks Merit and the Proposed Settlement is Not Reasonable

21. Based on the HarbourVest Claim and its filed response to the Debtor's objection, Respondent believes that the HarbourVest claim is meritless and the proposed settlement is not reasonable, fair and equitable, or in the best interest of the estate.

22. First, the proposed settlement is concerning particularly because HarbourVest's bare bones proof of claim contains very little in terms of allegations of specific conduct against the Debtor that would give rise to a \$60 million claim against this estate. While HarbourVest's response to the Debtor's claim objection is lengthy, it contains very little in real substance supporting its right to such a claim against the estate. The response also omits a number of key facts that are relevant and potentially fatal to its claim for damages against the Debtor's estate. Among them is the fact that Acis (and thereafter Reorganized Acis), along with Mr. Joshua Terry, managed HarbourVest's investment for years after it was made.⁷ Despite this fact, HarbourVest's alleged damages appear to be based largely on the difference between the value of its initial investment at confirmation of Acis's Plan and the current value of the investment—which amount was directly determined by the performance of the CLOs that Acis managed during this time.⁸ Neither the claim nor the response directly address the implications of Acis's management of the CLOs during the period following HarbourVest's investment. Nor does HarbourVest address or discuss performance of the CLOs, the market forces that may have caused HarbourVest's investment to lose value, or other factors influencing the current value of its investment. The

⁷ See, e.g., HarbourVest Proof of Claim 143, p. 5 ("The Claimant is a limited partner in one of the Debtor's managed vehicles, Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. ("HCLOF"). Acis Capital Management GP, L.L.C. and Acis Capital Management L.P. (together, "Acis"), the portfolio manager for HCLOF, filed for chapter 11 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas (the "Court") on January 30, 2018.").

⁸ See HarbourVest Response, Docket No. 1057, para. 40 ("HarbourVest has been injured from the Investment: not only has the Investment failed to accrue value, its value plummeted. The Investment's current value is far less than HarbourVest's initial contribution.").

speculative nature of the damages and the lack of specificity of the HarbourVest Claim and the role of Acis in the loss of value to HarbourVest all call into question the reliability of the allegations and the legal basis for the claim amount awarded in the settlement.

23. Also absent from Harbourvest's papers is any discussion of any contract or agreement between (i) HarbourVest and the Debtor; and (ii) any agreement that was executed in conjunction with HarbourVest's initial investment. While the proof of claim references a number of agreements, there is no explanation in the claim or in HarbourVest's response to the Debtor's claim objection of how these agreements give rise to liability against the *Debtor*. For example, neither the claim nor the HarbourVest Response (which includes more than 600 pages of attachments) attach *any* written agreement between HarbourVest and any other party. While HarbourVest has alleged a number of claims sounding in tort, many of those claims cannot exist absent a contract or other express relationship between the parties. Moreover, the terms of the relevant contracts themselves likely contain a number of provisions that may call into question Debtor's liability or would be otherwise relevant to merits of the HarbourVest Claim. For example, HarbourVest in its papers appears to assert or imply that the Debtor made a number of false or fraudulent representations to solicit HarbourVest's investment, but then fails to discuss or even identify the applicable agreements it alleges it was induced into signing in connection with its investment (this despite the substantial value of the investment when the Acis plan was confirmed).

24. Given these issues, among many others, the HarbourVest Claim is unsustainable both from a liability and damages standpoint and there are many very high hurdles HarbourVest would have to clear in seeking to prove liability against the Debtor and in proving its damages. For a long period of time, its investment was managed by Acis and the investment's performance was directly tied to Acis's inadequate performance as portfolio manager. Further, the value of

HarbourVest's investment is also directly tied to various market forces that may have impacted its value. The HarbourVest Claim is largely lacking in relevant facts and omits much salient information, such as who it contracted with in connection with its investment, the terms of such agreements, who controlled its investment during the entire period from November 2017 to the present, and the performance of its investment during the last two years. Given these issues, HarbourVest will be unable to demonstrate a causal connection between any conduct of the Debtor and the alleged damages it suffered from a reduction in value of its investment.

25. Because of the speculative nature of the HarbourVest Claim, and the fact that very little pleading or litigation has occurred, the proposed settlement in granting such a large claim is unreasonable, not fair and equitable, and not in the best interest of the estate. The lack of pending litigation, narrowing of threshold questions, and lack of detail in HarbourVest Claim make it impossible to determine whether the huge claim awarded under the proposed settlement is justified under the facts. Accordingly, the Motion should be denied.

C. The Proposed Settlement is an Improper Attempt by the Debtor to Purchase Votes in Support of its Plan and the Separate Classification of the HarbourVest Claim Constitutes Gerrymandering in Violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1122

26. The proposed settlement is a flagrant attempt by the Debtor to purchase votes in support of its Plan by giving HarbourVest a significant claim to which it has not shown itself entitled. Moreover, the separate classification of the HarbourVest Claim into two separate classes constitutes impermissible gerrymandering in violation of section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code. The proposed settlement essentially gives HarbourVest a claim it is not entitled to in exchange for votes in two separate classes. This is not a proper basis for a settlement and the Court should deny the Motion.

27. Section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, a plan may place a claim or an interest in a particular class only if such claim or interest is substantially similar to the other claims or interests of such class.

(b) A plan may designate a separate class of claims consisting only of every unsecured claim that is less than or reduced to an amount that the court approves as reasonable and necessary for administrative convenience.

11 U.S.C. § 1122.

28. “Chapter 11 requires classification of claims against a debtor for two reasons. Each class of creditors will be treated in the debtor's plan of reorganization based upon the similarity of its members' priority status and other legal rights against the debtor's assets. Proper classification is essential to ensure that creditors with claims of similar priority against the debtor's assets are treated similarly.” *In re Greystone III Joint Venture*, 995 F.2d 1274, 1277 (5th Cir. 1991).

29. “Section 1122 consequently must contemplate some limits on classification of claims of similar priority. A fair reading of both subsections suggests that ordinarily substantially similar claims, those which share common priority and rights against the debtor’s estate, should be placed in the same class.” *Id.* at 1278.

30. The Fifth Circuit has stated that there is “one clear rule that emerges from otherwise muddled caselaw on § 1122 claims classification: thou shalt not classify similar claims differently in order to gerrymander an affirmative vote on a reorganization plan.” *Id.* at 1279. The Court observed:

There must be some limit on a debtor’s power to classify creditors in such a manner. . . . Unless there is some requirement of keeping similar claims together, nothing would stand in the way of a debtor seeking out a few impaired creditors (or even one such creditor) who will vote for the plan and placing them in their own class.

In re Greystone III Joint Venture, 995 F.2d 1274, 1279 (5th Cir. 1991) (quoting *In re U.S. Truck Co.*, 800 F.2d 581, 586 (6th Cir. 1986)).

31. Here, the HarbourVest settlement and the classification of the HarbourVest Claim under the Plan blatantly violate the Fifth Circuit’s “one rule” concerning the classification of claims under section 1122. To the extent that HarbourVest even has a legitimate claim, not only should its claim be classified together with other unsecured creditors, its claim should be classified solely in one class. To allow the Debtor to do otherwise as proposed is improper gerrymandering in order to obtain a consenting class in express violation of section 1122.

D. There Are Other Reasons for the Court to Closely Scrutinize the Proposed Settlement that May Warrant Denial of the Motion

32. There are a number of other reasons for the Court to closely scrutinize the proposed settlement that may warrant denial of the Motion.

33. First, the granting to HarbourVest of a claim in the total amount of \$80 million potentially allows HarbourVest to achieve a significant windfall at the expense of other creditors and equity holders. The Debtor has asserted numerous times that the estate is solvent and, for this reason, the purported subordinated claim of \$35 million (if allowed and approved) may be worth just as much as its general unsecured claim. This is a huge figure in this case, outshined only by the Redeemer Committee, which has an actual arbitration award obtained after lengthy litigation. By contrast, the HarbourVest Claim contains only a few paragraphs of generalized allegations that essentially argue that the Debtor’s alleged actions related to the Acis bankruptcy, and this Court’s orders in the Acis case, are a “but for” cause of the loss of its investment. While the HarbourVest Response is lengthy, it lacks necessary details for the Court to determine whether HarbourVest *may* be entitled to the relief requested by the Motion. The other significant creditors in this case—*inter alia*, Redeemer, UBS and Acis—all had pending claims that were litigated. Nor is HarbourVest a trade creditor, vendor, or other contract counter-party of the Debtor. The HarbourVest Claim is thus uniquely situated in this case and, given the size and the nature of its

claims, should invite close scrutiny. Under these facts, the potential allowance of an \$80 million claim (less the value of its share in HCLOF, which may suffer by continued management by Acis) against the estate for an investment which was not held or managed by the Debtor would be a huge undue windfall.

34. Second, the Motion states that HarbourVest will vote its proposed allowed Class 8 (proposed at \$45 million) and Class 9 (proposed at \$35 million) claims in support of confirmation. There are at least two potential issues with this proposal. First, the deadline for parties to submit ballots was January 5, 2021, and as of the close of business on January 5, the HarbourVest Claim has not been allowed for voting purposes.⁹ Second, the Motion and proposed settlement agreement state that the HarbourVest Claim will be allowed for voting purposes only as a general unsecured claim in the amount of \$45 million. It is unclear how HarbourVest can, or would be authorized to, vote its purported Class 8 and 9 Claims in support of the Plan after the voting deadline and when the settlement provides only for a voting claim in Class 8.

35. Third, while the Motion addresses the factor of probability of success in the litigation, it does not discuss in detail the cost of doing so in relation to the amount to be paid to HarbourVest under the settlement or the likelihood that the Debtor will succeed in the litigation. In addition, unlike the claims filed by Acis and UBS, the HarbourVest Claim does not arise from pending litigation. At this point, relatively little litigation has occurred and the parties have not addressed threshold issues that might dramatically narrow the scope of the HarbourVest Claim. Rule 9019 requires an analysis as to whether the probability of success in litigation is outweighed by the consideration achieved under the settlement. *See In re Jackson Brewing Co.*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980) (The Court must “compare the terms of the compromise with the likely rewards

⁹ The hearing on the 3018 and 9019 motions are set concurrently with confirmation.

of litigation.”). Given the excessive amount to be paid under the settlement and the weakness of the HarbourVest Claim, this factor weighs in favor of denial of the Motion.

36. Fourth, it is unclear from the settlement papers whether the transfer by HarbourVest of its interest in HCLOF to the Debtor or an entity the Debtor designates will cause the value of the investment to be received by the Debtor’s estate. Further, the interest of HCLOF being conveyed under the proposed settlement may be subject to the Acis plan injunction, which could potentially prevent the Debtor’s estate from realizing the value of this interest. In the event the Court is inclined to approve the settlement, the order should make clear that the available value of the investment should be realized by the Debtor’s estate.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Respondent respectfully requests that the Court enter an order denying the Motion and providing Respondent such other and further relief to which he may be justly entitled.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Dated: January 6, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ D. Michael Lynn

D. Michael Lynn
State Bar I.D. No. 12736500
John Y. Bonds, III
State Bar I.D. No. 02589100
John T. Wilson, IV
State Bar I.D. No. 24033344
Bryan C. Assink
State Bar I.D. No. 24089009
BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFFER JONES LLP
420 Throckmorton Street, Suite 1000
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 405-6900 telephone
(817) 405-6902 facsimile
Email: michael.lynn@bondsellis.com
Email: john@bondsellis.com
Email: john.wilson@bondsellis.com
Email: bryan.assink@bondsellis.com

ATTORNEYS FOR JAMES DONDERO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that, on January 6, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via the Court's CM/ECF system on counsel for the Debtor and on all other parties requesting or consenting to such service in this case.

/s/ Bryan C. Assink

Bryan C. Assink

EXHIBIT 5

Douglas S. Draper, La. Bar No. 5073
ddraper@hellerdraper.com
Leslie A. Collins, La. Bar No. 14891
lcollins@hellerdraper.com
Greta M. Brouphy, La. Bar No. 26216
gbrouphy@hellerdraper.com
Heller, Draper & Horn, L.L.C.
650 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70130
Telephone: (504) 299-3300
Fax: (504) 299-3399
Attorneys for The Dugaboy Investment Trust and Get Good Trust

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

IN RE:	*	Chapter 11
	*	
	*	Case No. 19-34054sgj11
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.	*	
	*	
Debtor	*	

**OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER APPROVING
SETTLEMENT WITH HARBOURVEST (CLAIM NOS. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154)
AND AUTHORIZING ACTIONS CONSISTENT THEREWITH**

The Dugaboy Investment Trust and Get Good Trust (jointly, "Objectors"), submit this Objection for the purpose of objecting to the *Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Dkt. #1625] (the "Motion") filed by Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the "Debtor"). Through the Motion, the Debtor seeks approval of its compromise with HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (collectively, "HarbourVest") pursuant to Rule 9019 of the



Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”). In support of this objection, Objectors respectfully represent as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Objectors recognize that Courts favorably view settlements and, as a matter of course, generally approve settlements as being in the best interest of the bankruptcy estate. The settlement proposed herein, however, is different than other settlements inasmuch as it represents a 180 degree departure from the Debtor’s own analysis of the Claim of HarbourVest and the fact that the settlement is tied to HarbourVest approving the Debtor’s plan. Little or no information is provided by the Debtor as to why its initial analysis was flawed and what information or legal principal it discovered to change a zero claim into a massive claim that will have a significant impact on the recovery to creditors.

II. BACKGROUND

2. On October 16, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 19-12239 (CSS) (the “Delaware Court”).

3. On October 29, 2019, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “Committee”) was appointed by the U.S. Trustee in Delaware.

4. On December 4, 2019, the venue of this case was transferred. [Dkt. #186].

5. On July 16, 2020, this Court entered an order authorizing the Debtor to employ James P. Seery, Jr. as Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer of the Debtor. [See Dkt. #854].

6. On April 8, 2020, HarbourVest filed Proofs of Claim Numbers 143, 149, 149, 150, 153, and 154 (collectively, the “HarbourVest Claim”)¹.

7. On July 30, 2020, the Debtor filed *Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Dkt. #906] (the “Debtor Objection”), which contained an objection to the HarbourVest Claim.

8. On September 11, 2020, HarbourVest filed *HarbourVest Response to Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Dkt. #1057] (the “HarbourVest Response”).

9. The Debtor, in its *Disclosure Statement for the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Dkt. #1473 pgs. 40-41], described its position relative to the HarbourVest Claim as follows:

The Debtor intends to **vigorously** defend the HarbourVest Claims on various grounds The HarbourVest Entities invested approximately \$80,000,000.00 in HCLOF but seek an allowed claim in excess of 300 million dollars (after giving effect to treble damages for the alleged RICO violations)

10. On December 23, 2020, the Debtor filed the Motion seeking approval of a proposed settlement of the HarbourVest Claim under Rule 9019. [Dkt. # 1625].

11. The proposed settlement provides HarbourVest with the following:

- a. An allowed, general unsecured claim in the amount of \$45,000,000.00 [Dkt. #1625 pg. 9 pp.f]; and

¹ While HarbourVest has filed a number of claims, each filed claim is exactly the same except in the name of the claimant. See Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154.

- b. A \$35,000,000 claim in Class 9 [Dkt. #1625 pg. 9 pp.f].
12. An integral element of the settlement requires that HarbourVest will “support confirmation of the Debtor’s Plan including, but not limited to, voting its claims in support of the Plan.”
 13. The settlement also contains a provision that HarbourVest will transfer its entire interest in HCLOF to an entity to be designated by the Debtor. It is unclear whether HarbourVest has a right to transfer the interest and secondly, what the Debtor will do with the interest [Dkt. #1625 pp.f].
 14. The sole support for the Motion is the Declaration of John Morris [Dkt. #1631] which fails to account for the enormous change in the Debtor’s position between November 24, 2020 when the Disclosure Statement was approved and December 23, 2020 when the Motion was filed, a period of less than thirty (30) days.
 15. The Declaration of John Morris [Dkt. #1631] also contains no information as to the potential cost of the litigation, whether HarbourVest can transfer the interest or reasons, other than conclusory reasons, as to why the settlement is beneficial to the estate. The Debtor makes the assertion that the interest it is acquiring was worth \$22,000,000.00 as of December 1, 2020 without advising as to the basis for the valuation. Is it a book value and, if not, what was the methodology employed to arrive at the valuation? The Court has no basis to evaluate the settlement without essential information as to 1) how the asset being acquired is valued; 2) can the Debtor acquire the interest; and 3) how will the Debtor bring value to the estate in connection with the interest inasmuch as the Debtor has discretion as to where to place the asset to be acquired.

A. LEGAL STANDARDS

16. The law relative to approval of motions pursuant to BR 9019 is well settled. The settlement must be fair and equitable. *See In re Jackson Brewing Co.*, 624 F.2d 599, 602 (5th Cir. 1980). The factors the Court should consider are the following:

- (i) the probabilities of ultimate success should the claim be litigated;
- (ii) the complexity, expense, and likely duration of litigating the claim;
- (iii) the difficulties of collecting a judgment rendered from such litigation; and,
- (iv) all other factors relevant to a full and fair assessment of the wisdom of the compromise.

Protective Comm. for Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson, 390 U.S. 414 (1968).

17. Although the Debtor’s business judgment is entitled to a certain deference, “business judgment” is not alone determinative of the issue of court approval. *See In re Endoscopy Ctr. of S. Nev., LLC*, 451 B.R. 527, 536 (Bankr. D. Nev. 2011). However, notwithstanding the business judgment rule, a debtor does not have unfettered freedom to do what it wishes. *See In re Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.*, 403 B.R. 413, 426 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2009) (“[A]s a fiduciary holding its estate in trust and responsible to the court, a debtor in possession must administer its case and conduct its business in a fashion amenable to the scrutiny to be expected from creditor and court oversight.”).

B. ISSUES WITH THE SETTLEMENT

18. Objectors believe that the following issues are not explained or addressed in the Motion and, thus, the Motion should be denied:

- a) The settlement represents a radical change in the Debtor’s position that was set forth in its Disclosure Statement. While the Debtor asserts that its position is

based on its fear of parties' oral testimony, the size of the transactions at issue make the case a document case, as opposed to who said what, when and how. A review of the applicable documents to determine whether they support the Debtor's initial position is warranted, as opposed to stating that the case is based upon the credibility of a witness. This settlement is not the settlement of an automobile accident where the parties are disputing who ran a red light;

- b) The settlement requires HarbourVest to support and vote in favor of the Debtor's Plan. On its face this appears to be vote buying. The settlement should not be conditioned upon HarbourVest's support or non-support of the Plan and its vote in favor or against the Plan; and
- c) No information is provided as to whether the Debtor can acquire the interest in HCLOF, liquidate the interest, who will receive the interest, or how will the estate benefit from the interest to be acquired.

CONCLUSION

The settlement with HarbourVest has too many questions to be approved on the record before this Court and the parties, due to the Notice of the Motion, the holidays and the press of other litigation in this case, do not have the time to adequately investigate the propriety of the settlement.

January 8, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Douglas S. Draper.

Douglas S. Draper, La. Bar No. 5073

ddraper@hellerdraper.com

Leslie A. Collins, La. Bar No. 14891

lcollins@hellerdraper.com

Greta M. Brouphy, La. Bar No. 26216

gbrouphy@hellerdraper.com

Heller, Draper & Horn, L.L.C.
650 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
New Orleans, LA 70130
Telephone: (504) 299-3300
Fax: (504) 299-3399
*Attorneys for The Dugaboy Investment Trust
and Get Good Trust*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that on the 8th day of January, 2021, a copy of the above and foregoing *Objection To Debtor's Motion For Entry Of An Order Approving Settlement With Harbourvest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) And Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* has been served electronically to all parties entitled to receive electronic notice in this matter through the Court's ECF system as follows:

- David G. Adams david.g.adams@usdoj.gov, southwestern.taxcivil@usdoj.gov; dolores.c.lopez@usdoj.gov
- Amy K. Anderson aanderson@joneswalker.com, lfields@joneswalker.com
- Zachery Z. Annable zannable@haywardfirm.com
- Bryan C. Assink bryan.assink@bondsellis.com
- Asif Attarwala asif.attarwala@lw.com
- Joseph E. Bain JBain@joneswalker.com, kvrana@joneswalker.com; joseph-bain-8368@ecf.pacerpro.com; msalinas@joneswalker.com
- Michael I. Baird baird.michael@pbgc.gov, efile@pbgc.gov
- Sean M. Beach bankfilings@ycst.com, sbeach@ycst.com
- Paul Richard Bessette pbessette@KSLAW.com, ccisneros@kslaw.com; jworsham@kslaw.com; kbryan@kslaw.com; jcarvalho@kslaw.com; rmatsumura@kslaw.com
- John Y. Bonds john@bondsellis.com, joyce.rehill@bondsellis.com
- Larry R. Boyd lboyd@abernathy-law.com, lameson@abernathy-law.com
- Jason S. Brookner jbrookner@grayreed.com, lwebb@grayreed.com; acarson@grayreed.com
- Greta M. Brouphy gbrouphy@hellerdraper.com, dhepting@hellerdraper.com; esixkiller@hellerdraper.com; jmarino@hellerdraper.com
- M. David Bryant dbryant@dykema.com, csmith@dykema.com
- Candice Marie Carson Candice.Carson@butlersnow.com
- Annmarie Antoniette Chiarello achiarello@winstead.com
- Shawn M. Christianson schristianson@buchalter.com, cmcintire@buchalter.com
- James Robertson Clarke robbie.clarke@bondsellis.com
- Matthew A. Clemente mclemente@sidley.com, matthew-clemente-8764@ecf.pacerpro.com; efilingnotice@sidley.com; ebromagen@sidley.com; alyssa.russell@sidley.com; dtwomey@sidley.com

- Megan F. Clontz mclontz@spencerfane.com, lvargas@spencerfane.com
- Andrew Clubok andrew.clubok@lw.com
- Leslie A. Collins lcollins@hellerdraper.com
- David Grant Crooks dcrooks@foxrothschild.com,
etaylor@foxrothschild.com, jsagui@foxrothschild.com, plabov@foxrothschild.com, jmanfr
ey@foxrothschild.com
- Gregory V. Demo gdemo@pszjlaw.com,
jo'neill@pszjlaw.com; ljones@pszjlaw.com; jfried@pszjlaw.com; ikharasch@pszjlaw.com
; jmorris@pszjlaw.com; jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com; hwinograd@pszjlaw.com; kyee@pszjla
w.com
- Casey William Doherty casey.doherty@dentons.com,
dawn.brown@dentons.com; Docket.General.Lit.DAL@dentons.com; Melinda.sanchez@d
entons.com
- Douglas S. Draper ddraper@hellerdraper.com,
dhepting@hellerdraper.com; esixkiller@hellerdraper.com; jmarino@hellerdraper.com
- Lauren Kessler Drawhorn lauren.drawhorn@wickphillips.com,
samantha.tandy@wickphillips.com
- Vickie L. Driver Vickie.Driver@crowedunlevy.com,
crissie.stephenson@crowedunlevy.com; seth.sloan@crowedunlevy.com; elisa.weaver@cr
owedunlevy.com; ecf@crowedunlevy.com
- Jonathan T. Edwards jonathan.edwards@alston.com
- Jason Alexander Enright jenright@winstead.com
- Robert Joel Feinstein rfeinstein@pszjlaw.com
- Matthew Gold courts@argopartners.net
- Bojan Guzina bguzina@sidley.com
- Thomas G. Haskins thaskins@btlaw.com
- Melissa S. Hayward MHayward@HaywardFirm.com, mholmes@HaywardFirm.com
- Michael Scott Held mheld@jw.com, lcrumble@jw.com
- Gregory Getty Hesse ghesse@HuntonAK.com,
amckenzie@HuntonAK.com; tcanada@HuntonAK.com; creeves@HuntonAK.com
- Juliana Hoffman jhoffman@sidley.com, txefilingnotice@sidley.com; julianna-
hoffman-8287@ecf.pacerpro.com
- A. Lee Hogewood lee.hogewood@klgates.com,
haley.fields@klgates.com; matthew.houston@klgates.com; courtney.ritter@klgates.com; m
ary-beth.pearson@klgates.com
- Warren Horn whorn@hellerdraper.com,
dhepting@hellerdraper.com; esixkiller@hellerdraper.com; jmarino@hellerdraper.com
- John J. Kane jkane@krcl.com, ecf@krcl.com; jkane@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Jason Patrick Kathman jkathman@spencerfane.com,
gpronske@spencerfane.com; mclontz@spencerfane.com; lvargas@spencerfane.com
- Edwin Paul Keiffer pkeiffer@romclaw.com, bwallace@romclaw.com
- Jeffrey Kurtzman kurtzman@kurtzmansteady.com
- Phillip L. Lamberson plamberson@winstead.com
- Lisa L. Lambert lisa.l.lambert@usdoj.gov
- Paul M. Lopez bankruptcy@abernathy-law.com
- Faheem A. Mahmooth mahmooth.faheem@pbgc.gov, efile@pbgc.gov

- Ryan E. Manns ryan.manns@nortonrosefulbright.com
- Thomas M. Melsheimer tmelsheimer@winston.com, tom-melsheimer-7823@ecf.pacerpro.com
- Paige Holden Montgomery pmontgomery@sidley.com, txefilingnotice@sidley.com;paige-montgomery-7756@ecf.pacerpro.com;crognas@sidley.com
- J. Seth Moore smoore@ctstlaw.com, jsteele@ctstlaw.com
- John A. Morris jmorris@pszjlaw.com
- Edmon L. Morton emorton@ycst.com
- David Neier dneier@winston.com, dcunsolo@winston.com;david-neier-0903@ecf.pacerpro.com
- Holland N. O'Neil honeil@foley.com, jcharrison@foley.com;acordero@foley.com
- Rakhee V. Patel rpatel@winstead.com, dgalindo@winstead.com;achiarrello@winstead.com
- Charles Martin Persons cpersons@sidley.com
- Mark A. Platt mplatt@fbtlaw.com, aortiz@fbtlaw.com
- Jeffrey Nathan Pomerantz jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
- Kimberly A. Posin kim.posin@lw.com, colleen.rico@lw.com
- Linda D. Reece lreece@pbfc.com
- Penny Packard Reid preid@sidley.com, txefilingnotice@sidley.com;penny-reid-4098@ecf.pacerpro.com;ncade@sidley.com
- Davor Rukavina drukavina@munsch.com
- Amanda Melanie Rush asrush@jonesday.com
- Alyssa Russell alyssa.russell@sidley.com
- Douglas J. Schneller douglas.schneller@rimonlaw.com
- Brian Patrick Shaw shaw@roggedunnngroup.com, cashion@roggedunnngroup.com;jones@roggedunnngroup.com
- Michelle E. Shriro mshriro@singerlevick.com, scotton@singerlevick.com;tguillory@singerlevick.com
- Nicole Skolnekovich nskolnekovich@hunton.com, plozano@huntonak.com;astowe@huntonak.com;creeves@huntonak.com
- Jared M. Slade jared.slade@alston.com
- Frances Anne Smith frances.smith@judithwross.com, michael.coulombe@judithwross.com
- Eric A. Soderlund eric.soderlund@judithwross.com
- Martin A. Sosland martin.sosland@butlersnow.com, ecf.notices@butlersnow.com, velvet.johnson@butlersnow.com
- Laurie A. Spindler Laurie.Spindler@lgbs.com, Dora.Casiano-Perez@lgbs.com
- Jonathan D. Sundheimer jsundhimer@btlaw.com
- Kesha Tanabe kesha@tanabelaw.com
- Chad D. Timmons bankruptcy@abernathy-law.com
- Dennis M. Twomey dtwomey@sidley.com
- Basil A. Umari BUmari@dykema.com, pelliott@dykema.com
- United States Trustee ustpreion06.da.ecf@usdoj.gov
- Artoush Varshosaz artoush.varshosaz@klgates.com, Julie.garrett@klgates.com

- Donna K. Webb donna.webb@usdoj.gov,
brian.stoltz@usdoj.gov;CaseView.ECF@usdoj.gov;brooke.lewis@usdoj.gov
- Jaclyn C. Weissgerber bankfilings@ycst.com, jweissgerber@ycst.com
- Elizabeth Weller dallas.bankruptcy@publicans.com, dora.casiano-
perez@lgbs.com;Melissa.palo@lgbs.com
- Daniel P. Winikka danw@lfdslaw.com,
craigs@lfdslaw.com,dawnw@lfdslaw.com,ivys@lfdslaw.com
- Hayley R. Winograd hwinograd@pszjlaw.com
- Megan Young-John myoung-john@porterhedges.com

/s/Douglas S. Draper

EXHIBIT 6

Joseph M. Coleman (State Bar No. 04566100)
John J. Kane (State Bar No. 24066794)
KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN LOGAN PC
Bank of America Plaza
901 Main Street, Suite 5200
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone - (214) 777-4200
Telecopier - (214) 777-4299
Email: jcoleman@krcl.com
Email: jkane@krcl.com

ATTORNEYS FOR CLO HOLDCO, LTD.

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:	§	
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,	§	Case No. 19-34054-SGJ
	§	
Debtor.	§	Chapter 11
	§	

CLO HOLDCO, LTD.'S OBJECTION TO HARBOURVEST SETTLEMENT

TO THE HONORABLE STACEY G. JERNIGAN, U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

CLO Holdco, Ltd. ("**CLO Holdco**") respectfully files this *Objection to Harbourvest Settlement* (the "**Harbourvest Settlement Objection**") which seeks entry of an order from this Court denying the Debtor's *Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with Harbourvest (Claims Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* (the "**Harbourvest Settlement Motion**") for the reasons stated below. In support of the Harbourvest Settlement Objection, CLO Holdco respectfully states as follows:

**I.
BACKGROUND**

A. TRANSFERRING SHARES IN HCLOF



1. CLO Holdco owns 75,061,630.55 shares, or about 49.02% of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. ("**HCLOF**"). Other shareholders include Harbourvest 2017 Global AIF L.P., Harbourvest Global Fund L.P., Harbourvest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., and Harbourvest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HV International VIII Secondary L.P. (collectively, "**Harbourvest**"). Harbourvest owns approximately 49.98% of HCLOF. The remaining 1% is owned by the Debtor and a five other investors.

2. HCLOF is governed by a *Members Agreement Relating to the Company* dated November 15, 2017 by and between each of the members of HCLOF, including Harbourvest, the Debtor, and CLO Holdco (the "**Member Agreement**"). A copy of that agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

3. Section 6 of the Member Agreement addresses the "Transfer or Disposals of Shares." MEMBER AGREEMENT, § 6. The Member Agreement places strict restrictions on the sale or transfer of shares to entities other than the initial Member's own affiliates. *See id.* at §§ 6.1, 6.2. Before a Member can transfer its interests to a party other than its own affiliates it must: (i) obtain the prior written consent of the Portfolio Manager; and (ii) "offer to the other Members a right to purchase the Shares, on a pro rata basis with respect to their current Shares, at the same price (which must be cash) as such Shares are proposed to be purchased by the prospective third party purchaser pursuant to an irrevocable offer letter" (the "**Right of First Refusal**"). *Id.* As further stated in section 6.2 of the Member Agreement, "The other Members will have 30 days following receipt of the letter to determine whether to purchase their entire pro rata portion of the Shares proposed to be Transferred." *Id.* at § 6.2.

B. THE HARBOURVEST SETTLEMENT

4. On December 23, 2020, the Debtor filed the Harbourvest Settlement Motion. On the following day, the Debtor filed a copy of the Settlement Agreement referenced in the

Harbourvest Settlement Motion (the "**Settlement Agreement**") [Dkt. No. 3]. In the Settlement Agreement, Harbourvest represents and warrants that it is authorized to transfer its interest in HCLOF to the Transferee, HCMLP Investments, LLC (the "**Transferee**"). SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, Ex. A. § 3. Further, the Transferee and Debtor agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the Member Agreement. *Id.* at § 1.c.

5. In exchange for conveniently classified allowed claims under the Debtor's *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* (the "**Plan**") [Dkt. No. 1472], Harbourvest agrees to vote in favor of the Plan and to transfer all of its interests in HCLOF to the Transferee. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, § 1.

6. As detailed below, CLO Holdco objects to the Harbourvest Settlement Motion because Harbourvest has no authority to transfer its interests in HCLOF without first complying with the Right of First Refusal. The only way to effectuate such a transfer without first providing other members the Right of First Refusal is an intentionally inaccurate interpretation of the Member Agreement's contractual provisions that would render specific passages redundant and meaningless. More simply put, the only way Harbourvest and the Debtor could effectuate the Settlement Agreement is by violating fundamental tenets of contract interpretation.

II. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES

A. CONTRACT INTERPRETATION – AVOIDING REDUNDANCIES AND SURPLUS LANGUAGE

7. The Fifth Circuit recognizes fundamental tenets of contract interpretation, and notes that "contracts should be read as a whole, viewing particular language in the context in which it appears. *Woolley v. Clifford Chance Rogers & Wells, L.L.P.*, 51 F. App'x 930 (5th Cir. 2002) (citing Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 202 (1981)). The Fifth Circuit has applied substantially the same tenets of contract interpretation across the laws of various jurisdictions, and consistently reasons that "[a]ll parts of the agreement are to be reconciled, if possible, in order to avoid an

inconsistency. A specific provision will not be set aside in favor of a catch-all clause." *Broad v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.*, 642 F.2d 929, 947 (5th Cir. 1981) (internal citations omitted); and *see Hawthorne Land Co. v. Equilon Pipeline Co., LLC*, 309 F.3d 888, 892–93 (5th Cir. 2002); *Luv N' Care, Ltd. v. Grupo Rimar*, 844 F.3d 442, 447 (5th Cir. 2016); *Wooley*, 51 F.Appx. at 930.

8. Reconciliation of terms that would otherwise render other parts of a contract redundant is fundamental to proper contract interpretation. *Hawthorne Land*, 309 F.3d at 892-93. As the Fifth Circuit explained in *Hawthorne Land*, "each provision of a contract must be read in light of the other provisions so that each is given the meaning suggested by the contract as a whole. A contract should be interpreted so as to avoid neutralizing or ignoring a provision or treating it as surplusage." *Id.* (internal citations and quotations omitted). In other words, provisions of a contract should be read to create harmony, not internal inconsistencies, redundancies, and unnecessary surplus language. *See, e.g., Luv N' Care*, 844 F.3d at 447 (overturning district court on appeal by interpreting contract in manner that eliminated perceived redundancy).

B. ANALYZING THE MEMBER AGREEMENT

9. Section 6.1 of the Member Agreement will almost certainly be cited by the Debtor and Harbourvest as authority for their entry into the Settlement Agreement, regardless of whether other Members or the Portfolio Manager consent. It states, in pertinent part, that:

No Member shall sell, pledge, charge, mortgage, assign, assign by way of security, transfer, convey, exchange or otherwise dispose of its Shares or its commitment to settle purchases of Shares under the Subscription and Transfer Agreement (each a "Transfer"), other than to an Affiliate of an initial Member party hereto, without the prior written consent of the Portfolio Manager...

MEMBER AGREEMENT, § 6.1. Harbourvest will likely stress that under the terms of the Member Agreement, it can transfer its interests so long as the transfer is to "an Affiliate of an initial Member." Indeed, the Debtor will no doubt point out to this Court that Harbourvest is

conveniently transferring its interests in HCLOF to an Affiliate of the Debtor, and that the Debtor is an initial Member listed in the Member Agreement.

10. Section 6.1, however, must be read in the context of the Member Agreement, and in conjunction with the transfer restrictions found in section 6.2. Read together it is clear that the consent exception allowing a transfer in 6.1 was intended to allow a Member to transfer its shares to *its* own Affiliate, without required consents and effectuating a Right of First Refusal. Doing so would allow inter-company transfers within a corporate structure without the need for complicated procedures. Applying Fifth Circuit precedent, this interpretation fits squarely within the agreement and gives weight to the terms of section 6.2 of the Member Agreement, as explained below.

(i) Surplusage – Specific Allowance of Transfers by CLO Holdco to Debtor Affiliates

11. Recall that both CLO Holdco and the Debtor are initial Members to the Member Agreement. MEMBER AGREEMENT, p. 3. Section 6.2 of the Member Agreement states, in pertinent part, that "Prior to making any Transfer of Shares (other than Transfers to Affiliates of an initial Member or, *in the case of CLO Holdco or a Highland Principal, to Highland, its Affiliates or another Highland Principal*) a Member must first..." comply with the Right of First Refusal. *Id.* at § 6.2 (emphasis added). The italicized language above is important for two reasons: (i) it specifically enumerates that CLO Holdco can transfer its interests to Debtor Affiliates without having to pursue the Right of First Refusal; and (ii) it allows only limited transfers between Members, as opposed to between a Member and an Affiliate of an initial Member.

12. If, as the Debtor and Harbourvest will likely argue, Members are allowed to transfer their interests to any Affiliates of any other initial Members, there is absolutely no need for the Member Agreement to specifically authorize CLO Holdco to transfer its interests to the Debtor's Affiliates. Per Fifth Circuit fundamentals of contract interpretation, that purported redundancy

should not be discarded as mere surplusage, and the Member Agreement should be interpreted in a manner that gives weight to that provision. *Hawthorne Land*, 309 F.3d at 892-93.

13. If the Member Agreement is read to literally allow all "Transfers to Affiliates of an initial Member" there would be no reason to expressly set forth allowed transfers between specific Members and other Member's Affiliates. If the Member Agreement sought to list all allowed transfers between Members and their Affiliates, it should have similarly noted that any Member could transfer its interest to any Harbourvest Member entity, as each Harbourvest Member entity is an Affiliate of the other Harbourvest Member entities. Alternatively, if the specific enumeration of CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals' transfer rights was surplusage, it would presumably have listed other parties' rights, or had inclusive language such as "including but not limited to" or "for example." The Member Agreement lacks such language and, as a result, should be interpreted in a manner that both gives weight to the specific provision while reconciling other provisions of the contract.

(ii) Absurd Results – Disparate Transfer Rights Between Members

14. Note that the Member Agreement does not generally allow a transfer of interests from Member to Member unless specifically enumerated. Section 6.2 specifically allows only CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals to make transfers to other Members, but those other Members include only the Debtor or another Highland Principal. MEMBER AGREEMENT, § 6.2. It does not allow the Debtor to transfer interests to any Member, and does not expressly allow any Member, other than limited transfers by CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals, to transfer interests to any other Member. *Id.* For instance, if the Debtor wished to transfer its interests to CLO Holdco, it would first have to offer all of the other Members their Right of First Refusal. *Id.*

15. Similarly, if Harbourvest wished to transfer its interest to CLO Holdco, it could not do so without first providing the Right of First Refusal to all other Members. *Id.* As noted above,

however, allowing a Member to transfer its interest to an Affiliate of any initial Member would allow all of the Members to transfer their interests to any Harbourvest Member entity, as the Harbourvest Members are Affiliates of each other. Given the specific enumeration of CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals' rights to inter-Member transfers, it would be inconsistent to expand that specific provision to allow all transfers by all Members to any Harbourvest entity without first providing a Right of First Refusal.

16. Such a reading would lead to absurd results. It would grant similarly situated Members profoundly disparate rights under the agreement, and could easily lead to manipulation. For instance, because the Harbourvest Members are technically Affiliates of an initial Member (each other), they could obtain control of all of the interests in HCLOF without any Member receiving a Right of First Refusal for any transfer. No other Member could do that. For instance, if CLO Holdco wished to acquire other Members' interests, the transferring member (including Harbourvest) would have to offer a Right of First Refusal in every instance. To resolve that potential disparate treatment—though CLO Holdco and Harbourvest own nearly identical ownership interests in HCLOF—CLO Holdco would have to form an Affiliate and acquire interests through the Affiliate. That simply cannot be the intended result of the Member Agreement.

17. Instead, the Member Agreement must be read to require Harbourvest to provide a Right of First Refusal to the other Members of HCLOF before transferring its interests to either the Debtor or the Transferee.

C. THE RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL IN BANKRUPTCY

18. Most cases addressing third party rights of first refusal in bankruptcy involve the assignment of leases and landlords' rights of first refusal. In those cases, courts analyze whether such a provision in the debtor's contract is a defacto restriction on assignment that may be excised

from the agreement. This case is very different. Here, it is a creditor that owes a right of first refusal to another non-debtor entity.

19. Even so, at least one court has issued telling commentary on a bankruptcy court's ability to excise provisions of a bargained-for contract, stating "A bankruptcy court's authority to excise a bargained for element of a contract is questionable and modification of a nondebtor contracting party's rights is not to be taken lightly." *In re E-Z Serve Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 289 B.R. 45, 51-52 (Bankr. M.D.N.C. 2003) (citing *In re Joshua Slocum Ltd.*, 922 F.2d 1081, 1091 (3d Cir. 1991)). CLO Holdco was unable to find any case that would allow a bankruptcy court to invalidate or otherwise excise a third party's right of first refusal in what largely amounts to a non-debtor contract.

20. As the Member Agreement requires Harbourvest to provide a Right of First Refusal to the non-Debtor Members under section 6.2 of the Agreement, and such Members have 30 days to review and determine whether to purchase their pro-rata shares offered by Harbourvest, Harbourvest lacks contractual authority to enter into the Settlement Agreement.

D. HARBOURVEST'S LACK OF AUTHORITY PRECLUDES ENFORCEMENT OF SETTLEMENT

21. Harbourvest has not completed its conditions precedent to the transfer of its interest to Transferee under the Member Agreement. As detailed above, and in section 6.2 of the Agreement, Harbourvest must effectuate the Right of First Refusal before it can transfer its interests in HCLOF. MEMBER AGREEMENT, § 6.2. Harbourvest is, in essence, bound by the condition precedent of effectuating the Right of First Refusal before it is authorized under the Member Agreement to enter into the Settlement Agreement.

22. Courts should not enforce a settlement agreement where a party has a condition precedent to entry into the agreement and fails to satisfy that condition. *In re De La Fuente*, 409 B.R. 842, 846 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2009). As noted in part in *De La Fuente*, the court would not recognize

or enforce a settlement where the parties were subject to conditions precedent before the settlement could be effective, and the conditions precedent were not satisfied. This Court should similarly deny Harbourvest's proposed settlement, as it would deny the Members' Right of First Refusal, which is the benefit of their bargain under the Member Agreement.

**III.
PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, CLO Holdco requests that this Court grant the Objection and enter an order denying the Harbourvest Settlement Motion.

DATED: January 8, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN LOGAN PC

By: /s/ John J. Kane
Joseph M. Coleman
State Bar No. 04566100
John J. Kane
State Bar No. 24066794

901 Main Street, Suite 5200
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone - (214) 777-4200
Telecopier - (214) 777-4299
Email: jcoleman@krcl.com
Email: jkane@krcl.com

ATTORNEYS FOR CLO HOLDCO, LTD.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 8, 2020, a true and correct copy of the foregoing CLO Holdco Objection was served via the Court's electronic case filing (ECF) system upon all parties receiving such service in this bankruptcy case; and via e-mail upon the United States Trustee at Lisa.L.Lambert@usdoj.gov and upon the following parties:

Paige Holden Montgomery
Penny P. Reid
Juliana L. Hoffman
2021 McKinney Avenue, Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 74201
Email: pmontgomery@sidley.com
preid@sidley.com
jhoffman@sidley.com

Bojan Guzina
Matthew A. Clemente
Dennis M. Twomey
Alyssa Russell
One South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Email: bguzina@sidley.com
mclemente@sidley.com
dtwomey@sidley.com
alyssa.russell@sidley.com

Counsel for Harbourvest:

M. Natasha Labovitz
Erica S. Weisgerber
Daniel E. Stroik
Vickie L. Driver
Christina W. Stephenson
Email: nlabovitz@debevoise.com
eweisgerber@debevoise.com
destroik@debevoise.com
vickie.driver@crowedunlevy.com
crissie.stephenson@crowedunlevy.com

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz
Ira D. Kharasch
John A. Morris
Gregory V. Demo
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Email: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
ikharasch@pszjlaw.com
jmorris@pszjlaw.com
gdemo@pszjlaw.com

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Email: MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com

/s/ John J. Kane

John J. Kane

EXHIBIT 7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

IN RE:

CHAPTER 11

CASE NO.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL 19-34054-
MANAGEMENT, L.P. SGJLL

Debtor.

Confidential - Under Protective Order

REMOTE DEPOSITION OF
MICHAEL PUGATCH
Zoom Videoconference
01/11/2021
1:07 P.M. (EDT)

REPORTED BY: AMANDA GORRONO, CLR
CLR NO. 052005-01
JOB NO. 188591

<p>1</p> <p>2 01/11/2021</p> <p>3 1:07 P.M. (EDT)</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 REMOTE ORAL DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL</p> <p>7 PUGATCH, held virtually via Zoom</p> <p>8 Videoconferencing, pursuant to the</p> <p>9 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure before</p> <p>10 Amanda Gorrone, Certified Live Note</p> <p>11 Reporter, and Notary Public of the State</p> <p>12 of New York.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2 A P P E A R A N C E S: (Via Remote)</p> <p>3 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES</p> <p>4 Attorneys for Debtor</p> <p>5 780 Third Avenue</p> <p>6 New York, New York 10017</p> <p>7 BY: JOHN MORRIS, ESQ.</p> <p>8 HAYLEY WINOGRAD, ESQ.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFFER JONES</p> <p>11 Attorneys for Jim Dondero</p> <p>12 420 Throckmorton Street</p> <p>13 Fort Worth, Texas 76102</p> <p>14 BY: JOHN WILSON, ESQ.</p> <p>15 BRYAN ASSINK, ESQ.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON</p> <p>18 Attorneys for HarbourVest</p> <p>19 919 Third Avenue</p> <p>20 New York, New York 10022</p> <p>21 BY: ERICA WEISGERBER, ESQ.</p> <p>22 M. NATASHA LABOVITZ, ESQ.</p> <p>23 EMILY HUSH, ESQ.</p> <p>24 DANIEL STROIK, ESQ.</p> <p>25</p>
<p>1</p> <p>2 A P P E A R A N C E S: (Via Remote)</p> <p>3 KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN & LOGAN</p> <p>4 Attorneys for CLO Holdco Limited</p> <p>5 Bank of America Plaza</p> <p>6 901 Main Street</p> <p>7 Dallas, Texas 75202</p> <p>8 BY: JOHN KANE, ESQ.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 HELLER, DRAPER, HAYDEN, PATRICK, & HORN</p> <p>11 Attorneys for The Dugaboy Investment</p> <p>12 Trust and the Get Good Trust</p> <p>13 650 Poydras Street</p> <p>14 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130</p> <p>15 BY: DOUGLAS DRAPER, ESQ.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 LATHAM & WATKINS</p> <p>18 Attorney For UBS</p> <p>19 885 Third Avenue</p> <p>20 New York, New York</p> <p>21 BY: SHANNON MCLAUGHLIN, ESQ.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 4</p> <p>1</p> <p>2 A P P E A R A N C E S: (Via Remote)</p> <p>3 KING & SPALDING</p> <p>4 Attorney for Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.</p> <p>5 1180 Peachtree Street, NE</p> <p>6 Atlanta, Georgia 30309</p> <p>7 BY: MARK MALONEY, ESQ.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>12 ALIZA GOREN, ESQ.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

Page 6	Page 7																				
<p>1</p> <p>2 INDEX</p> <p>3</p> <p>WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PG</p> <p>4 MICHAEL PUGATCH MR. WILSON 10, 148</p> <p>MR. KANE 122</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER 147</p> <p>6</p> <p>EXHIBITS</p> <p>7</p> <p>EXHIBIT</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> <th>PAGE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9 Exhibit 1 Proof of Claim 143 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 Exhibit 2 Proof of Claim 149 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13 Exhibit 3 Declaration of Michael Pugatch in Support of Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018(a)...</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17 Exhibit 4 Member Agreement 28 pages..</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18 Exhibit 5 HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First Omnibus Objection 617 pages.....</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 Exhibit 6 Offering Memorandum 122 pages.....</td> <td>61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23 Exhibit 7 Share Subscription and Transfer Agreement 31 pages.....</td> <td>63</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	9 Exhibit 1 Proof of Claim 143 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....	16	11 Exhibit 2 Proof of Claim 149 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....	17	13 Exhibit 3 Declaration of Michael Pugatch in Support of Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018(a)...	18	17 Exhibit 4 Member Agreement 28 pages..	21	18 Exhibit 5 HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First Omnibus Objection 617 pages.....	22	21 Exhibit 6 Offering Memorandum 122 pages.....	61	23 Exhibit 7 Share Subscription and Transfer Agreement 31 pages.....	63	<p>1</p> <p>2 Exhibit 8 E-mail 08/15/2017..... 68</p> <p>3 Exhibit 9 11/29/2017 E-mail with cover letter Highland Capital Management..... 79</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 Exhibit 10 2004 Examination of Investor in Highland CLO Funding Ltd. 10/10/2018.... 83</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 Exhibit 11 Declaration of John A. Morris in Support of the Debtor'S Motion For Entry of an Order Approving Settlement With Harbourvest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions, 82 pages..... 109</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 REQUESTS</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> <th>PG</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>22 Transcript be marked Confidential under the Protective Order.....</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	DESCRIPTION	PG	22 Transcript be marked Confidential under the Protective Order.....	10
DESCRIPTION	PAGE																				
9 Exhibit 1 Proof of Claim 143 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....	16																				
11 Exhibit 2 Proof of Claim 149 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages.....	17																				
13 Exhibit 3 Declaration of Michael Pugatch in Support of Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018(a)...	18																				
17 Exhibit 4 Member Agreement 28 pages..	21																				
18 Exhibit 5 HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First Omnibus Objection 617 pages.....	22																				
21 Exhibit 6 Offering Memorandum 122 pages.....	61																				
23 Exhibit 7 Share Subscription and Transfer Agreement 31 pages.....	63																				
DESCRIPTION	PG																				
22 Transcript be marked Confidential under the Protective Order.....	10																				
Page 8	Page 9																				
<p>1</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: I'm John Wilson</p> <p>3 with the firm of Bonds Ellis Eppich</p> <p>4 Schafer Jones LP. And I represent Jim</p> <p>5 Dondero.</p> <p>6 MR. MORRIS: John Morris and</p> <p>7 Hayley Winograd of Pachulski Stang</p> <p>8 Ziehl & Jones for the Debtor.</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Erica</p> <p>10 Weisgerber from Debevoise & Plimpton</p> <p>11 for HarbourVest.</p> <p>12 MR. KANE: John Kane of Kane</p> <p>13 Russell Coleman & Logan, for CLO</p> <p>14 Holdco Limited.</p> <p>15 MR. DRAPER: Douglas Draper of</p> <p>16 Heller Draper & Horn, for The Dugaboy</p> <p>17 Investment Trust and the Get Good</p> <p>18 Trust.</p> <p>19 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Shannon</p> <p>20 McLaughlin from Latham & Watkins LLP</p> <p>21 for UBS.</p> <p>22 MR. MALONEY: Mark Maloney from</p> <p>23 King & Spalding, on behalf of Highland</p> <p>24 CLO Funding Limited.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm joined on</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2 the line by my colleagues from</p> <p>3 Debevoise, Natasha Labovitz and Emily</p> <p>4 Hush, and Aliza Goren from HarbourVest</p> <p>5 is on the line, as well.</p> <p>6 MR. WILSON: As a preliminary</p> <p>7 matter, the witness' counsel has</p> <p>8 produced some documents to us that</p> <p>9 they've requested be subject to the</p> <p>10 confidentially order or a brief</p> <p>11 protective order entered at Document</p> <p>12 Number 382, in this case.</p> <p>13 And she's also requested that</p> <p>14 all counsel and participants in this</p> <p>15 deposition agree to be bound by the</p> <p>16 terms of that order, because some of</p> <p>17 the documents that were produced are</p> <p>18 stamped "confidential," and they want</p> <p>19 to maintain that confidentially.</p> <p>20 Do we have an agreement of all</p> <p>21 counsel and participants on the</p> <p>22 deposition to be bound by the terms of</p> <p>23 that agreed protective order?</p> <p>24 (All agreed.)</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Okay. I think</p>																				

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 that was everyone. Thank you all for</p> <p>3 confirming. And the deposition will</p> <p>4 be marked "confidential" until and</p> <p>5 unless HarbourVest designates the</p> <p>6 testimony otherwise.</p> <p>7 MR. WILSON: And that's fine.</p> <p>8 (Whereupon, a request for</p> <p>9 Transcript be marked Confidential</p> <p>10 under the Protective Order was made.)</p> <p>11 MICHAEL PUGATCH,</p> <p>12 called as a witness, having been</p> <p>13 first duly affirmed by a Notary Public of</p> <p>14 the State of New York, was examined and</p> <p>15 testified as follows:</p> <p>16 EXAMINATION</p> <p>17 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>18 Q. All right. Mr. Pugatch, how do</p> <p>19 you pronounce your name? I'm sorry.</p> <p>20 A. Yep, you've got it. Pugatch.</p> <p>21 Q. Pugatch. Okay. Can you state</p> <p>22 your full name for the record?</p> <p>23 A. Yeah. Michael Pugatch.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And you've been</p> <p>25 designated by HarbourVest to discuss some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 matters related to the 9019 motion. And</p> <p>3 specifically we asked that HarbourVest</p> <p>4 produce a witness who could talk about the</p> <p>5 negotiations of the settlement with the</p> <p>6 Debtor, and also the factual allegations</p> <p>7 underlying HarbourVest's Proof of Claim,</p> <p>8 and those described in HarbourVest's</p> <p>9 response to the claim objection, including</p> <p>10 without limitation, its investment with</p> <p>11 Acis/HCLOF in the alleged representations</p> <p>12 made by the Debtor and/or Acis/HCLOF to</p> <p>13 HarbourVest, and any and all agreements</p> <p>14 entered into between HarbourVest and any</p> <p>15 other party related to its investment.</p> <p>16 Do you agree that you're the</p> <p>17 best person to talk about these matters on</p> <p>18 behalf of HarbourVest?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Have you given a</p> <p>21 deposition before?</p> <p>22 A. I have.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So you understand how it</p> <p>24 works that you're under oath, and that I'm</p> <p>25 going to be asking questions and you're</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 going to be giving answers. If at any</p> <p>3 time I ask a question that you don't</p> <p>4 understand, or we've had some problems</p> <p>5 with sometimes connectivity issues with</p> <p>6 Zoom. But yeah, any time that you don't</p> <p>7 understand my question or you didn't catch</p> <p>8 it, I'll be happy to repeat it.</p> <p>9 Also, one thing I found with</p> <p>10 Zoom is that it's easier to talk over</p> <p>11 people. I'll try not to talk over you. I</p> <p>12 would ask that you try to ensure that I've</p> <p>13 finished asking my question before you</p> <p>14 start your answer. And I will likewise</p> <p>15 try to ensure that you've finished your</p> <p>16 answer before start my next question.</p> <p>17 And at any time during this</p> <p>18 deposition if you feel the need to take a</p> <p>19 break, that's totally okay with me. The</p> <p>20 one thing that I would ask is if I've just</p> <p>21 asked a question, that you answer the</p> <p>22 question before requesting the break.</p> <p>23 And if we have that agreement</p> <p>24 and the ground rules, then I think I'm</p> <p>25 ready to start asking you my questions.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Sounds good.</p> <p>3 Q. What's your current address?</p> <p>4 A. 47 Wayne Road in Needham,</p> <p>5 Massachusetts.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And where are you located</p> <p>7 today?</p> <p>8 A. At that address.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. That's your home address?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And is anyone in the room with</p> <p>12 you there?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. And did you talk with anyone</p> <p>15 about your deposition today?</p> <p>16 A. Only counsel.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And did you go over the</p> <p>18 facts of the underlying investment and the</p> <p>19 settlement negotiations with your counsel?</p> <p>20 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm going to</p> <p>21 object on privilege grounds. He</p> <p>22 can -- he prepared for the deposition</p> <p>23 with counsel. I don't think you can</p> <p>24 inquire into specifics of the</p> <p>25 preparation.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: Okay. Well, you</p> <p>3 know, he was designated to talk about</p> <p>4 these matters, and I'm just asking if</p> <p>5 he discussed these matters with his</p> <p>6 counsel his before his testimony.</p> <p>7 That's all. I'm not asking the</p> <p>8 substance of those communications.</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: You're asking</p> <p>10 about conversations with counsel. How</p> <p>11 about you just ask if he's prepared to</p> <p>12 talk about those topics today?</p> <p>13 MR. WILSON: Okay.</p> <p>14 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Are you prepared to talk about</p> <p>16 those topics today?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Now, HarbourVest has</p> <p>19 filed several proofs of claim in this</p> <p>20 matter, and it looks like those are</p> <p>21 numbered 143 on behalf of HarbourVest,</p> <p>22 217 Global Fund L.P., and 144 HarbourVest</p> <p>23 2017 Global AIF, 149 HarbourVest Partners</p> <p>24 L.P., 150 HarbourVest Dover Street, IX</p> <p>25 Investment L.P., 153 HarbourVest -- or I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 sorry, HV International VIII Secondary</p> <p>3 L.P., and 154 HarbourVest Skew Base AIF</p> <p>4 LP.</p> <p>5 And you're here to talk on</p> <p>6 behalf of all of those entities, and you</p> <p>7 have, for purpose of this settlement and</p> <p>8 you're -- the 9019 motion, these proofs of</p> <p>9 claim are all lumped together as one</p> <p>10 claim; is that correct?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm just going</p> <p>12 to object quickly and clarify that</p> <p>13 he's not here as a 30(b)(6) witness,</p> <p>14 but he is here as someone from</p> <p>15 HarbourVest who signed those proofs of</p> <p>16 claim. So with that, I'll let you</p> <p>17 continue.</p> <p>18 A. I'll just answered the question,</p> <p>19 yes, as a representative on behalf of all</p> <p>20 of those entities. I would defer to</p> <p>21 counsel, from a legal perspective, whether</p> <p>22 these are treated as a single or separate</p> <p>23 claims.</p> <p>24 MR. WILSON: Okay. And we can</p> <p>25 move on for now.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 I'm going to submit the first</p> <p>3 exhibit. It's going to be Exhibit</p> <p>4 No. 1 to the deposition. I'm sending</p> <p>5 it by E-mail, and I'm also going to</p> <p>6 use a share screen.</p> <p>7 (Whereupon, Exhibit 1, Proof of</p> <p>8 Claim 143 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages,</p> <p>9 was marked for identification.)</p> <p>10 MR. WILSON: So this document</p> <p>11 right here is Claim Number 143 filed</p> <p>12 on April 8, 2020, and this one is</p> <p>13 filed on behalf of HarbourVest 2017</p> <p>14 Global Fund L.P.</p> <p>15 If we go down, scroll to the</p> <p>16 annex to proof of claim, it's Page 5</p> <p>17 of the document. It says that the</p> <p>18 Claimant is a limited partner in one</p> <p>19 of the Debtor's managed vehicles,</p> <p>20 Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.</p> <p>21 And I'm going to now send out an</p> <p>22 E-mail with Exhibit No. 2. I'm going</p> <p>23 to pull this Exhibit No. 2 document up</p> <p>24 on the share screen, as well. I guess</p> <p>25 that's right.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 (Whereupon, Exhibit 2, Proof of</p> <p>3 Claim 149 filed 4/08/2020 nine pages,</p> <p>4 was marked for identification.)</p> <p>5 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Can you see the official proof,</p> <p>7 official form 410 proof of claim on your</p> <p>8 screen?</p> <p>9 A. The first one that you shared?</p> <p>10 Q. I'm now on Exhibit No. 2. Is it</p> <p>11 showing up on your screen?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Actually, I'm sorry. Is</p> <p>14 it now showing up on your screen?</p> <p>15 A. Now, it's showing up, yep.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So this one is Proof of</p> <p>17 Claim 149, filed on the same date. And</p> <p>18 this one's filed on behalf HarbourVest</p> <p>19 Partners L.P. And I'm going to scroll</p> <p>20 down to the annex to proof of claim, which</p> <p>21 looks largely like the annex to the</p> <p>22 previous proof of claim we looked at.</p> <p>23 But this one says, in Paragraph</p> <p>24 No. 2, the Claimant manages investment</p> <p>25 funds that are limited partners in one of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 the Debtor's managed vehicles, Highland</p> <p>3 CLO Funding, Ltd.</p> <p>4 And can you tell me why this</p> <p>5 HarbourVest Partners L.P. filed a separate</p> <p>6 proof of claim, from the entities that</p> <p>7 were investors in HCLOF?</p> <p>8 A. I would only be able to answer</p> <p>9 that, based on conversations with counsel.</p> <p>10 Q. But in any event, HarbourVest</p> <p>11 Partners L.P. did not invest in HCLOF,</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 A. Not directly on behalf of</p> <p>14 itself, no.</p> <p>15 Q. All right. I'm going to stop</p> <p>16 that share screen.</p> <p>17 MR. WILSON: And this is going</p> <p>18 to be Exhibit Number 3.</p> <p>19 (Whereupon, Exhibit 3,</p> <p>20 Declaration of Michael Pugatch in</p> <p>21 Support of Motion of HarbourVest</p> <p>22 Pursuant to Rule 3018(a), was marked</p> <p>23 for identification.)</p> <p>24 MR. WILSON: And Exhibit No. 3</p> <p>25 that I've just submitted via E-mail,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 and I'm about to put it up on the</p> <p>3 screen, is the Declaration of</p> <p>4 HarbourVest. Let me get it up here,</p> <p>5 so you can see it. This is the</p> <p>6 declaration of Michael Pugatch in</p> <p>7 support of motion of HarbourVest</p> <p>8 pursuant to Rule 3018(a).</p> <p>9 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Have you seen this document</p> <p>11 before?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And, in fact, this is your</p> <p>14 declaration; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And at the first line of this,</p> <p>17 of Paragraph 1 says that you're the</p> <p>18 managing director of HarbourVest Partners</p> <p>19 LLC?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. And how is HarbourVest Partners</p> <p>22 LLC connected to these claims?</p> <p>23 A. That is the corporate entity or</p> <p>24 managing member of all of the underlying</p> <p>25 funds that are managed on behalf of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 HarbourVest Partners L.P.</p> <p>3 Q. And you're the managing director</p> <p>4 of that entity?</p> <p>5 A. A managing director to that</p> <p>6 entity, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. You said "a managing director,"</p> <p>8 are there others?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Who are the others?</p> <p>11 A. There are over 50 managing</p> <p>12 directors at HarbourVest Partners LLC.</p> <p>13 Q. And are you the managing</p> <p>14 director that has charge of this</p> <p>15 particular HarbourVest investment, the one</p> <p>16 in HCLOF?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 MR. WILSON: All right. I beg</p> <p>19 your patience. I'm trying to conduct</p> <p>20 this deposition solo. I've got a lot</p> <p>21 of stuff I've got to go through. So</p> <p>22 I'll do my best to do it efficiently.</p> <p>23 But this next exhibit I'm going</p> <p>24 to submit is going to be Exhibit No.</p> <p>25 4. I'm sending it in the E-mail now.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 (Whereupon, Exhibit 4, Member</p> <p>3 Agreement 28 pages, was marked for</p> <p>4 identification.)</p> <p>5 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Can you see this on your share</p> <p>7 screen?</p> <p>8 A. I can.</p> <p>9 Q. This is the Members Agreement</p> <p>10 relating to the Company.</p> <p>11 A. (Nods.)</p> <p>12 Q. I'm just going to scroll down.</p> <p>13 Okay. So this is the signature page for</p> <p>14 the HarbourVest entities that were</p> <p>15 invested in this company. And it says</p> <p>16 that you were the authorized person to</p> <p>17 sign on behalf of the first two entities:</p> <p>18 HarbourVest Dover Street, HarbourVest 2017</p> <p>19 Global, and then the next one here it says</p> <p>20 you're managing director. And here we see</p> <p>21 that HarbourVest Partners LLC.</p> <p>22 And if we scroll down, we see</p> <p>23 that you're the managing director of</p> <p>24 HarbourVest Partners LLC, again, on behalf</p> <p>25 of HV International, and that you're an</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 authorized person on behalf of HarbourVest</p> <p>3 Skew Base.</p> <p>4 So you signed all these</p> <p>5 agreements on behalf of the HarbourVest</p> <p>6 entities, when HarbourVest made its</p> <p>7 investment in HCLOF. Would that be</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Sorry that was</p> <p>11 cumbersome, but I needed to get through</p> <p>12 it.</p> <p>13 MR. WILSON: I'm going to now</p> <p>14 stop that share screen. And I'll need</p> <p>15 to go to Exhibit No. 5. I'm E-mailing</p> <p>16 out Exhibit No. 5 right now.</p> <p>17 (Whereupon, Exhibit 5,</p> <p>18 HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First</p> <p>19 Omnibus Objection 617 pages, was</p> <p>20 marked for identification.)</p> <p>21 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>22 Q. This is -- I'll do another share</p> <p>23 screen -- this is Docket 1057 filed in the</p> <p>24 Highland bankruptcy. And this is</p> <p>25 HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Omnibus Objection.</p> <p>3 Did you participate in the</p> <p>4 creation of this document?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. So you had an opportunity to</p> <p>7 review this document, before it was filed?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. And you agree with the</p> <p>10 statements and the positions taken in this</p> <p>11 document?</p> <p>12 A. I do.</p> <p>13 Q. All right. So what this says in</p> <p>14 Paragraph 8, that by the summer of 2017,</p> <p>15 HarbourVest was engaged in preliminary</p> <p>16 discussions with Highland, regarding the</p> <p>17 investment.</p> <p>18 First off, why was HarbourVest</p> <p>19 engaged in preliminary discussions with</p> <p>20 Highland?</p> <p>21 A. Highland had approached</p> <p>22 HarbourVest with an investment</p> <p>23 opportunity. This was really borne out of</p> <p>24 discussions that we had with them around a</p> <p>25 couple of investment opportunities, that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 this opportunity with HCLOF being the one</p> <p>3 that by the summer of 2017, as stated</p> <p>4 here, was in, was advancing through</p> <p>5 discussions.</p> <p>6 Q. And which individuals at</p> <p>7 Highland were you engaged in discussions</p> <p>8 with? By "you," I mean HarbourVest.</p> <p>9 A. Yeah, I mean, originally it was</p> <p>10 through a couple of members of their</p> <p>11 investor relations team. My first point</p> <p>12 of contact was with Brad Eden, and then</p> <p>13 subsequently progressed to a larger subset</p> <p>14 of employees of Highland.</p> <p>15 Q. And who on behalf of HarbourVest</p> <p>16 was engaging in these discussions?</p> <p>17 A. It was primarily myself, my</p> <p>18 colleague, or two -- two colleagues</p> <p>19 primarily, alongside myself.</p> <p>20 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't catch the</p> <p>21 last part.</p> <p>22 A. Sorry. Myself and two other</p> <p>23 colleagues primarily.</p> <p>24 Q. And who are these two other</p> <p>25 colleagues?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Dustin Willard and then a more</p> <p>3 junior member of the HarbourVest team.</p> <p>4 Q. When you say "the HarbourVest</p> <p>5 team," what does that mean?</p> <p>6 A. So the broader investment team</p> <p>7 and specifically in this context, the</p> <p>8 secondary investment team at HarbourVest,</p> <p>9 that this was an opportunity for.</p> <p>10 Q. So who made the final decision,</p> <p>11 on behalf of HarbourVest, to make this</p> <p>12 investment?</p> <p>13 A. Ultimately it was a decision</p> <p>14 made by the investment committee of</p> <p>15 HarbourVest.</p> <p>16 Q. And who's on that investment</p> <p>17 committee?</p> <p>18 A. It's a four-member committee</p> <p>19 comprised of managing directors within the</p> <p>20 firm.</p> <p>21 Q. And who are those managing</p> <p>22 directors?</p> <p>23 A. I don't recall at the time who</p> <p>24 the members were. I can tell you the</p> <p>25 members now, of that committee. It has</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 changed or evolved over time.</p> <p>3 Q. And that committee included you?</p> <p>4 A. I was involved in the</p> <p>5 decisionmaking of that, yes, correct.</p> <p>6 Q. So you were part of the four-man</p> <p>7 committee that made this decision?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. All right. I'm going to go back</p> <p>10 to what we've marked as Exhibit 3, which</p> <p>11 is your declaration. And it says in</p> <p>12 Paragraph 2, that HarbourVest is a passive</p> <p>13 minority investor in Highland CLO funds,</p> <p>14 HCLOF, and by the way, I haven't stated</p> <p>15 this before, but in this deposition if I</p> <p>16 say HCLOF, I'm going to be referring to</p> <p>17 Highland CLO funds.</p> <p>18 But it says that the vehicle is</p> <p>19 managed by Highland Capital Management,</p> <p>20 L.P.</p> <p>21 And why do you say that that</p> <p>22 vehicle was managed by Highland Capital</p> <p>23 Management, L.P.?</p> <p>24 A. I believe that is the named</p> <p>25 investment manager of HCLOF, per the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 organization documents of that vehicle.</p> <p>3 Q. You believe that that was the</p> <p>4 investment manager on the organization</p> <p>5 documents, which --</p> <p>6 A. Of the various transaction</p> <p>7 documents that we entered into, in</p> <p>8 connection with our investment.</p> <p>9 Q. Would those have been the</p> <p>10 documents that you had entered on November</p> <p>11 the 15 of 2017?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. It says that HarbourVest</p> <p>14 initially invested \$73,522,928 for roughly</p> <p>15 49 percent interest in HCLOF; and more</p> <p>16 specifically, that would be a 49.98</p> <p>17 percent interest in HCLOF, correct?</p> <p>18 A. Sounds right, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And then HarbourVest</p> <p>20 contributed an additional \$4,998,501</p> <p>21 following a capital call, and it's</p> <p>22 received three dividends, each totally</p> <p>23 \$1,570,429.</p> <p>24 Is all of that correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. And has HarbourVest received any</p> <p>3 additional dividends, since the making of</p> <p>4 this declaration?</p> <p>5 A. No, we have not.</p> <p>6 Q. Now, I want to skip down to</p> <p>7 Paragraph 3, where it says that</p> <p>8 HarbourVest expected proceeds from the</p> <p>9 original HCLOF investment were projected</p> <p>10 to exceed 135 million.</p> <p>11 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>12 A. That was the original projected</p> <p>13 value of the investment, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Well, whose expectation was</p> <p>15 that?</p> <p>16 A. Those were figures, as I recall,</p> <p>17 that were originally provided to us by</p> <p>18 Highland to form the basis of our due</p> <p>19 diligence that we went through, and</p> <p>20 penultimately were included as part of our</p> <p>21 investment thesis in making the</p> <p>22 investment.</p> <p>23 Q. So your testimony is that</p> <p>24 Highland told you that your investment</p> <p>25 would be worth over \$135 million?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 the form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>5 Go ahead, Mike.</p> <p>6 A. That was, that was part of our</p> <p>7 original due diligence, on the investment</p> <p>8 opportunity.</p> <p>9 Q. When you say part of your due</p> <p>10 diligence, are you saying that the number</p> <p>11 originated from Highland or that the</p> <p>12 number originated from your due diligence</p> <p>13 operations?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form.</p> <p>16 A. The number originally came from</p> <p>17 Highland and formed the basis upon which</p> <p>18 we conducted due diligence on the</p> <p>19 investment opportunity.</p> <p>20 Q. And after performing due</p> <p>21 diligence, you were satisfied that that</p> <p>22 was a reasonable projection?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And what was the, what was the</p> <p>25 estimated date, in which the value of your</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 investment would exceed the \$135 million?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. I don't recall exactly. That</p> <p>6 would have been over, over several years.</p> <p>7 And again, this was the -- this was the</p> <p>8 projected value based on the original</p> <p>9 investment or the assets that were held by</p> <p>10 HCLOF, at the time of our investment.</p> <p>11 Q. Now, when you talk about a</p> <p>12 portfolio manager -- I'm sorry, when you</p> <p>13 talk about investment manager, are you</p> <p>14 referring to the portfolio manager?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. So what's the difference in an</p> <p>17 investment manager and a portfolio</p> <p>18 manager?</p> <p>19 A. So in the context of this</p> <p>20 investment, the investment manager. We --</p> <p>21 we had -- HarbourVest had an investment</p> <p>22 with HCLOF. Highland was the investment</p> <p>23 manager of HCLOF that in turn held equity</p> <p>24 positions in a variety of CLOs, which had</p> <p>25 various portfolio managers associated with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 those, all Highland affiliates.</p> <p>3 Q. And so who was the portfolio</p> <p>4 manager for the HarbourVest investment in</p> <p>5 HCLOF?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. There were various underling</p> <p>9 portfolio managers, depending on the</p> <p>10 underlying CLO position.</p> <p>11 Q. Well, who was the initial</p> <p>12 portfolio manager?</p> <p>13 A. So, again it would depend on</p> <p>14 which underlying assets we're talking</p> <p>15 about. HCLOF was a diversified portfolio</p> <p>16 of multiple underlying CLO equity</p> <p>17 positions, all with portfolio managers</p> <p>18 that were Highland affiliates, as we</p> <p>19 understood it.</p> <p>20 Q. Well, I'm going to go back to</p> <p>21 Exhibit 1, Paragraph 2, this says, in the</p> <p>22 second sentence, "Acis Capital Management</p> <p>23 GP, LLC, and Acis Capital Management,</p> <p>24 L.P., together Acis, the portfolio manager</p> <p>25 for HCLOF," and then it continues on,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 "filed for Chapter 11."</p> <p>3 Is this proof of claim correct,</p> <p>4 when it states that Acis Capital</p> <p>5 Management GP, LLC, and Acis Capital</p> <p>6 Management, L.P., were the portfolio</p> <p>7 manager for HCLOF?</p> <p>8 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 A. I know that there was an issue</p> <p>11 with the portfolio manager for at least</p> <p>12 the Acis CLOs that were held by HCLOF.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, how do you distinguish</p> <p>14 between the Acis CLOs and the Highland</p> <p>15 CLOs? Is that based on who was managing</p> <p>16 them?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. Again, they were all underlying</p> <p>20 investments of HCLOF. We didn't</p> <p>21 distinguish the portfolio manager, if you</p> <p>22 will, of those vehicles, other than again</p> <p>23 they were Highland affiliates.</p> <p>24 Q. But it's fair to say that Acis</p> <p>25 was managing at least a portion of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 HCLOF investment, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Correct. The underlying</p> <p>4 investments held by HCLOF, correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And did anything -- from the</p> <p>6 time that you -- well, let's just go to</p> <p>7 the -- I think we had the members</p> <p>8 agreement up a second ago. This would</p> <p>9 have been Exhibit 4.</p> <p>10 Yeah, right here. No. 14,</p> <p>11 Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. is listed as</p> <p>12 the portfolio manager on the members</p> <p>13 agreement.</p> <p>14 Is that accurate, that Highland</p> <p>15 HCF Advisor, Ltd. was the portfolio</p> <p>16 manager?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form. Can you state as of what date</p> <p>19 you're asking, Counsel?</p> <p>20 MR. WILSON: Well, the date of</p> <p>21 this memorandum is, it says right</p> <p>22 here, 15 November 2017.</p> <p>23 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>24 Q. So as of the date November 15,</p> <p>25 2017, who was the portfolio manager for</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 this investment?</p> <p>3 A. I don't recall the specific</p> <p>4 names of the various entities that sat</p> <p>5 below the HCLOF level or below Highland</p> <p>6 Capital, as the investment manager of</p> <p>7 HCLOF.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, are you familiar with a</p> <p>9 company called Brigade?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And was that company a</p> <p>12 sub-manager of this investment?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>14 form.</p> <p>15 A. Not at the time of our</p> <p>16 investment.</p> <p>17 Q. Not at the time. Well, when did</p> <p>18 the portfolio managers begin to change in</p> <p>19 this investment?</p> <p>20 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. Do you mean subsequent to our</p> <p>23 investment?</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. So as I understand it in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 connection with the Acis bankruptcy that</p> <p>3 took place, there was a change in the</p> <p>4 underlying either portfolio manager of</p> <p>5 certain of the CLOs, the Acis-managed CLOs</p> <p>6 or Acis-branded CLOs, I should say, and/or</p> <p>7 sub-advisor of those CLOs.</p> <p>8 Q. And was that at the direction of</p> <p>9 the Chapter 11 trustee?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>11 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>12 Q. And so when this investment was</p> <p>13 initially made, was Highland HCF Advisor,</p> <p>14 Ltd. the portfolio manager of the entire</p> <p>15 investment?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall the specifics</p> <p>19 underneath the HCLOF entity.</p> <p>20 Q. Well, there aren't any other</p> <p>21 portfolio managers listed on this</p> <p>22 document, that I can see.</p> <p>23 Is there any place in this</p> <p>24 document that you can point me to that</p> <p>25 would identify another portfolio manager?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>3 form. The document speaks for itself.</p> <p>4 A. Again, I think we may be</p> <p>5 distinguishing here between portfolio</p> <p>6 manager at the HCLOF level and portfolio</p> <p>7 manager sub-advisor, again, I'm not sure</p> <p>8 the proper terminology as it relates to</p> <p>9 each of the underlying CLOs that were</p> <p>10 partially owned by HCLOF.</p> <p>11 Q. Well, after the Acis bankruptcy</p> <p>12 was filed, and after the Chapter 11</p> <p>13 trustee appointed Acis as a portfolio</p> <p>14 manager of at least part of HCLOF, did</p> <p>15 Highland HCF Advisor continue to serve as</p> <p>16 portfolio manager?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. All of HarbourVest's interaction</p> <p>20 was with Highland as the investment</p> <p>21 manager of HCLOF. My understanding of the</p> <p>22 change in those entities related to the</p> <p>23 portfolio management of the underlying</p> <p>24 Acis CLOs, not a change in the portfolio</p> <p>25 manager, at the HCLOF level.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. Well, Highland is listed as a</p> <p>3 member under this -- Highland Capital</p> <p>4 Management LLP is listed as a member under</p> <p>5 this Member Agreement; is that correct?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. If that's what the document</p> <p>9 says, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. I'm going to look -- let me stop</p> <p>11 my share screen for a second.</p> <p>12 All right. I'm now at the top</p> <p>13 of Page 5 of this Exhibit 4, where it</p> <p>14 says, "Dover IX shall mean HarbourVest</p> <p>15 Dover Street IX Investment L.P."</p> <p>16 And Dover IX was the largest</p> <p>17 single investor of the HarbourVest Group;</p> <p>18 is that correct?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. All right. I'm now going to go</p> <p>21 down to Paragraph 5. I'm sorry, it's not</p> <p>22 Paragraph 5. Paragraph 4, where it says</p> <p>23 "Composition of Advisory Board" in</p> <p>24 Paragraph 4.1, The Company shall establish</p> <p>25 an Advisory Board composed of two</p>

<p>Page 38</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 individuals, one of whom shall be a</p> <p>3 representative of CLO Holdco and one of</p> <p>4 whom shall be a representative of</p> <p>5 Dover IX.</p> <p>6 And did this Advisory Board get</p> <p>7 created?</p> <p>8 A. I believe it was created, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And who was the representative</p> <p>10 for CLO Holdco on the Advisory Board?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q. Who was the representative for</p> <p>13 Dover IX on the Advisory Board?</p> <p>14 A. I can't recall whether it was</p> <p>15 myself or one other colleague who jointly</p> <p>16 manages this investment with me.</p> <p>17 Q. You don't recall if you were on</p> <p>18 the Advisory Board?</p> <p>19 A. The Advisory Board never met</p> <p>20 formally under its capacity as an Advisory</p> <p>21 Board.</p> <p>22 Q. Well, if you look down in</p> <p>23 Paragraph 4.3, I've got my mouse pointed</p> <p>24 here, I don't know if you can see it.</p> <p>25 About two-thirds of the way down in this</p>	<p>Page 39</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 paragraph it says, "The consent of the</p> <p>3 Advisory Board shall be required to</p> <p>4 approve the following actions," and then</p> <p>5 it lists a number of things.</p> <p>6 Did the Advisory Board not have</p> <p>7 to -- was it not required that the</p> <p>8 Advisory Board ever meet, because they</p> <p>9 didn't take any of these actions?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>11 Objection to form.</p> <p>12 A. There may have been one or two</p> <p>13 actions taken by the Advisory Board, I'm</p> <p>14 looking at the list here to see what those</p> <p>15 may even have been, during the duration of</p> <p>16 our investment; but if so, those would</p> <p>17 have been written resolutions or written</p> <p>18 consents, as opposed to any meeting that</p> <p>19 was convened amongst the entire Advisory</p> <p>20 Board.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And the entire Advisory</p> <p>22 Board is just two individuals, correct?</p> <p>23 A. Correct, that's my</p> <p>24 understanding.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And if you go up a few</p>
<p>Page 40</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 sentences above that in Paragraph 4.3 it</p> <p>3 says, The portfolio manager shall not act</p> <p>4 contrary to advice of the Advisory Board</p> <p>5 with respect to any action or</p> <p>6 determination expressly conditioned herein</p> <p>7 or in the offering memorandum on the</p> <p>8 consider approval of the Advisory Board.</p> <p>9 So the portfolio manager did not</p> <p>10 have the authority to disregard the advice</p> <p>11 of the Advisory Board; is that correct?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form; misstates the document.</p> <p>14 A. With respect to the limited role</p> <p>15 that the Advisory Board would have to</p> <p>16 play, yes, that would be my read.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, what is your understanding</p> <p>18 of a reset transaction?</p> <p>19 A. Has to do with a refinancing and</p> <p>20 reset of the investment period of an</p> <p>21 underlying CLO.</p> <p>22 Q. And would a reset transaction be</p> <p>23 contained within this -- these actions</p> <p>24 that the Advisory Board's consent is</p> <p>25 required to approve?</p>	<p>Page 41</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. No, it would not.</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>4 MR. MALONEY: Join.</p> <p>5 Q. It would not?</p> <p>6 A. It would not.</p> <p>7 Q. Well, if a reset was to be</p> <p>8 proposed, who would have the discretion to</p> <p>9 make that decision to enter a reset</p> <p>10 transaction?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>12 form and foundation.</p> <p>13 MR. MALONEY: Join.</p> <p>14 A. That would be Highland as the</p> <p>15 manager of HCLOF, who owns the equity</p> <p>16 position to the underlying CLOs.</p> <p>17 Q. So you're saying that Highland</p> <p>18 would have the exclusive authority to</p> <p>19 enter a reset transaction?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 MR. MALONEY: Join.</p> <p>24 Q. What if HarbourVest objected to</p> <p>25 a reset transaction? Would it have any</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 rights or remedies, in your understanding?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm going to</p> <p>4 object to form. And also just object</p> <p>5 to the extent that this is calling for</p> <p>6 legal conclusions.</p> <p>7 Mike --</p> <p>8 MR. WILSON: I've ask the</p> <p>9 witness, within his understanding of</p> <p>10 the way this investment worked.</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: If you have an</p> <p>12 understanding separate from any other</p> <p>13 conversations with counsel, Mike, you</p> <p>14 can certainly answer.</p> <p>15 A. Within my understanding,</p> <p>16 HarbourVest would not have had any ability</p> <p>17 or rights to object to a reset or for</p> <p>18 similar actions by Highland, as the</p> <p>19 manager of the HCLOF.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And just to, just for</p> <p>21 clarity, in 4.2 it says that, All actions</p> <p>22 taken by the Advisory Board shall be (i)</p> <p>23 by a unanimous vote of all of the members</p> <p>24 of the Advisory Board in attendance; or</p> <p>25 (ii), by written consent in lieu of a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 meeting signed by all of the members of</p> <p>3 the Advisory Board.</p> <p>4 And we've talked about how there</p> <p>5 were two members, one of which represented</p> <p>6 CLO Holdco and one of which represented</p> <p>7 HarbourVest, and it was your testimony</p> <p>8 that you don't recall a meeting ever being</p> <p>9 conducted that you believed that there had</p> <p>10 been some written consents issued by the</p> <p>11 Advisory Board; is that correct?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form.</p> <p>14 A. That is my recollection, yes.</p> <p>15 Q. I'm sorry? I didn't hear your</p> <p>16 answer.</p> <p>17 A. That is my recollection, yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So what is the Advisory</p> <p>19 Board's general function in your</p> <p>20 understanding?</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 You can answer, Mike, if you</p> <p>24 know, other than, you know, legal</p> <p>25 conclusions, things like that, legal</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 advice.</p> <p>3 And also, Mike, you're welcome</p> <p>4 to look at the document, I think John</p> <p>5 is E-mailing you the documents as</p> <p>6 well. I don't know if you have the</p> <p>7 full document in front of you.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can pull</p> <p>9 it up here.</p> <p>10 A. I mean, my understanding is the</p> <p>11 Advisory Board, the Advisory Board's</p> <p>12 involvement is as spelled as in Section</p> <p>13 4.3 of the agreement that you have on the</p> <p>14 screen. And that is the extent of the</p> <p>15 role that the Advisory Board would play.</p> <p>16 Q. Well, but as a practical matter,</p> <p>17 what did that entail?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. Again, as a practical matter,</p> <p>21 the listed items, which I can't see, that</p> <p>22 are off the screen further down in 4.3 are</p> <p>23 the items that would require approval by</p> <p>24 the Advisory Board.</p> <p>25 Q. But other than those items, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Advisory Board was not a routine part of</p> <p>3 the decision-making of the portfolio</p> <p>4 manager?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form.</p> <p>7 A. Not at all.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you say "not at all"?</p> <p>9 A. Not at all, no.</p> <p>10 Q. I'm going to refer back to</p> <p>11 Exhibit 5, which was Document -- or Docket</p> <p>12 1057. I'll put that back on the share</p> <p>13 screen. I wanted you to scroll, sorry.</p> <p>14 It's a long document.</p> <p>15 I want you to look at</p> <p>16 Paragraph 37, which should be on your</p> <p>17 screen. And it says that these are</p> <p>18 misrepresentations that HarbourVest</p> <p>19 alleges were made by Highland. And the</p> <p>20 first bullet point states that, "Highland</p> <p>21 never informed HarbourVest that Highland</p> <p>22 had no intention of paying the Arbitration</p> <p>23 Award and was undertaking steps to ensure</p> <p>24 that Mr. Terry could not collect on his</p> <p>25 judgment."</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Now, Mr. Terry did not have an</p> <p>3 arbitration award against Highland; is</p> <p>4 that correct?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form and foundation.</p> <p>7 A. My understanding is there was an</p> <p>8 Arbitration Award, awarded for the benefit</p> <p>9 of Mr. Terry.</p> <p>10 Q. But that award was against Acis,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form.</p> <p>14 A. I don't know all of the details.</p> <p>15 I do know that Acis was a subsidiary of</p> <p>16 Highland, and there was an arbitration</p> <p>17 award that was for the benefit of</p> <p>18 Mr. Terry.</p> <p>19 Q. But you would agree with me that</p> <p>20 if, if Highland, or I'm sorry if Mr. Terry</p> <p>21 had an arbitration award against Acis,</p> <p>22 then Highland would not have any</p> <p>23 obligation to pay that award?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>25 form of the question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>3 the form. Objection to the extent</p> <p>4 that it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>5 I don't -- Mike, if you have a</p> <p>6 layman's understanding of the answer</p> <p>7 to that question, you're welcome to</p> <p>8 answer. But if not, don't answer.</p> <p>9 A. My understanding was Acis was a</p> <p>10 controlled subsidiary of Highland's.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Well, the next bullet</p> <p>12 point says that, "Highland did not inform</p> <p>13 HarbourVest that it undertook the</p> <p>14 transfers to siphon assets away from Acis,</p> <p>15 L.P., and that such transfers would</p> <p>16 prevent Mr. Terry from collecting on the</p> <p>17 Arbitration Award."</p> <p>18 So if your understanding was</p> <p>19 that Highland was responsible for the</p> <p>20 arbitration award, then why is it relevant</p> <p>21 that Highland siphoned assets away from</p> <p>22 Acis, L.P.?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>25 Can you clarify that question,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 John? I think the beginning of it was</p> <p>3 a little muddled.</p> <p>4 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>5 Q. Well, this objection says that</p> <p>6 Highland had -- or response to objection,</p> <p>7 says that Highland had no intention of</p> <p>8 paying the arbitration award, but that</p> <p>9 seems to conflict with the next bullet</p> <p>10 point that says that it undertook</p> <p>11 transfers to siphon assets away from Acis,</p> <p>12 L.P., to prevent Mr. Terry from collecting</p> <p>13 on the arbitration award.</p> <p>14 So where were those assets being</p> <p>15 siphoned to?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form and foundation.</p> <p>18 If you're capable of answering</p> <p>19 that question, Mike, you can.</p> <p>20 A. I don't know the specific</p> <p>21 details of where those assets were</p> <p>22 siphoned off to, other than it was to</p> <p>23 another Highland affiliate.</p> <p>24 Q. The next sentence says that,</p> <p>25 "Highland simply did not inform</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 HarbourVest and represented to HarbourVest</p> <p>3 that the reason for changing the portfolio</p> <p>4 manager for HCLOF was because Acis was</p> <p>5 toxic in the industry."</p> <p>6 Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And it seems when I read these</p> <p>9 documents that have been filed in the</p> <p>10 Highland bankruptcy, and also the Acis</p> <p>11 bankruptcy, that there's a difference in</p> <p>12 position as to which entity, being either</p> <p>13 Highland or HarbourVest, had the belief</p> <p>14 that the Acis name was toxic. Can you</p> <p>15 shed any light on that?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. I can unequivocally say that the</p> <p>19 idea to change the portfolio manager or</p> <p>20 the idea that the Acis brand was toxic did</p> <p>21 not come from HarbourVest.</p> <p>22 Q. That was not at HarbourVest's</p> <p>23 suggestion or insistence?</p> <p>24 A. Absolutely not.</p> <p>25 Q. Well, whose suggestion was it</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 that the Acis name was toxic?</p> <p>3 A. Somebody at Highland.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know who?</p> <p>5 A. I don't recall the conversation</p> <p>6 where that first came up or who said, or</p> <p>7 who at Highland said that.</p> <p>8 Q. But that conversation did occur</p> <p>9 prior to HarbourVest's investment?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. So Acis was previously the</p> <p>12 portfolio manager for HCLOF prior to</p> <p>13 November 15, 2017, and now November 17 --</p> <p>14 or 15th, 2017, the portfolio manager was</p> <p>15 changed.</p> <p>16 And what is HarbourVest's</p> <p>17 position as to why that change in</p> <p>18 portfolio manager damaged it?</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection;</p> <p>20 form, objection to the extent it calls</p> <p>21 for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>22 Mike, you can answer --</p> <p>23 MR. WILSON: I'm not asking for</p> <p>24 a -- with all due respect, I'm not</p> <p>25 asking for a legal conclusion. I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 asking for his understanding why the</p> <p>3 change in the portfolio manager</p> <p>4 damaged HarbourVest.</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>6 You can provide any</p> <p>7 non-privileged answer that you have,</p> <p>8 Mike, if any.</p> <p>9 A. Ultimately my understanding is</p> <p>10 that that change in portfolio manager and</p> <p>11 the subsequent litigation between Acis,</p> <p>12 Highland, and Josh Terry led to material</p> <p>13 diminution in value, as it relates to the</p> <p>14 underlying assets of HCLOF stemming from</p> <p>15 Highland's decision not to comply with the</p> <p>16 arbitration award to Mr. Terry.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Now, if you go up to</p> <p>18 Page 4 in this document, it says that on</p> <p>19 October 27th, and this is Paragraph 11</p> <p>20 now, "On October 27, 2017, Acis' portfolio</p> <p>21 management rights for HCLOF were</p> <p>22 transferred to Highland HCF"; is that</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A. That sounds right, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And this is over two weeks prior</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 to HarbourVest's investment, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. So HarbourVest had full</p> <p>5 knowledge that that the portfolio manager</p> <p>6 of HCLOF was being changed prior to its</p> <p>7 investment, correct?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>10 form.</p> <p>11 And just to clarify, you're</p> <p>12 asking him, HarbourVest, he's</p> <p>13 testifying on behalf of himself. I</p> <p>14 could just take a standing objection</p> <p>15 to that because I know sometimes</p> <p>16 you're just saying HarbourVest meaning</p> <p>17 Mike, so...</p> <p>18 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And just to be clear,</p> <p>20 HCLOF changed its portfolio manager on</p> <p>21 October 27, 2017, but after the Acis</p> <p>22 bankruptcy was initiated the Chapter 11</p> <p>23 trustee made changes to the portfolio</p> <p>24 manager, correct?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form, foundation.</p> <p>3 A. I know there were changes</p> <p>4 subsequent to the Acis bankruptcy, to the</p> <p>5 underlying management of the Acis CLOs.</p> <p>6 Q. All right. I'm going to go back</p> <p>7 to Paragraph 37, and I want to look at</p> <p>8 these next two bullet points.</p> <p>9 It says that, in the third</p> <p>10 bullet point, that "Highland indicated to</p> <p>11 HarbourVest that the dispute with</p> <p>12 Mr. Terry (which appeared on a litigation</p> <p>13 schedule presented to HarbourVest during</p> <p>14 diligence) would have no impact on</p> <p>15 investment activities."</p> <p>16 And that would be the opinion of</p> <p>17 Highland, correct?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form. The opinion of Highland? Is</p> <p>20 that what you meant to ask?</p> <p>21 MR. WILSON: Right.</p> <p>22 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>23 Q. That's Highland expressing its</p> <p>24 opinion to HarbourVest, correct?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>

<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch 2 form. 3 A. I would just say Highland 4 presented that as facts to HarbourVest. 5 Q. Okay. And the next one, it says 6 that "Highland expressed confidence in the 7 ability of HCLOF to reset or redeem the 8 CLOs notwithstanding that Highland was 9 using HCLOF as part of its scheme to avoid 10 the pending Arbitration Award." 11 That's again an opinion, right, 12 that Highland expressed confidence in the 13 ability of HCLOF? 14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to 15 form. Objection to the extent it 16 calls for a legal conclusion. 17 A. Ultimately, their ability, or 18 HCLOF's ability to reset or redeem the 19 CLOs would be subject to market conditions 20 and the ability to actually affect those 21 transactions, but they expressed their, 22 you know, their belief or view in HCLOF's 23 ability to do that notwithstanding the, 24 that change in portfolio manager. 25 Q. Well, in Paragraph 39 on that</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch 2 same page, it says, "In reliance on 3 Highland's misrepresentations and 4 omissions, HarbourVest invested in HCLOF." 5 Now, HarbourVest is a 6 sophisticated investor, correct? 7 A. Correct. 8 Q. And if we were to go to 9 Paragraph 36, it says, right here in the 10 middle, "These facts were material: 11 indeed, HarbourVest expressed concern and 12 requested further information regarding 13 the Transfers, the Arbitration Award, and 14 their implications for HCLOF, and the 15 investment's closing date was delayed." 16 And the closing date was 17 ultimately November 15, 2017, correct? 18 A. Correct. 19 Q. What was the initial closing 20 date that had to be delayed? 21 A. I believe it was scheduled for 22 November 1st. 23 Q. So HarbourVest had full 24 knowledge of these facts that it, that it 25 lays out here forming the basis of the</p>
<p>Page 56</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch 2 alleged misrepresentations, and they 3 requested further information regarding 4 those facts. 5 Did they receive any further 6 information? 7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the 8 form of the question. 9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to 10 form. Misstates testimony. 11 A. We did have subsequent 12 conversations and, I believe, receive 13 subsequent information describing the 14 intent around, and the, you know, new 15 structure, pro forma structure, of the 16 action that Highland had undertaken. And 17 part of the reason for the delay in the 18 closing was to ensure that we had adequate 19 time to diligence those changes, ask 20 questions, in connection with a thorough 21 due diligence process, and ensure that the 22 underlying legal structure was still 23 sound. 24 Q. And HarbourVest was investing 25 over \$73 million, correct?</p>	<p>Page 57</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch 2 A. Right. 3 Q. And HarbourVest had made 4 investments of this nature previously, 5 correct? 6 A. We did. 7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to 8 form. 9 A. HarbourVest has made hundreds of 10 investment over its years, yes. 11 Q. And HarbourVest has conducted 12 due diligence regarding its investments in 13 the past, correct? 14 A. Correct. 15 Q. And HarbourVest received 16 additional information on items of concern 17 and reviewed that information and 18 satisfied itself that this was an 19 appropriate investment, correct? 20 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to 21 form. Misstates testimony. 22 A. On the back of 23 misrepresentations by Highland, yes. 24 MR. WILSON: Well, I think 25 that's nonresponsive and I object.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. I'm just, I'm just, reading from</p> <p>3 your pleading that you filed in the</p> <p>4 bankruptcy, where you say that these were</p> <p>5 material facts, and HarbourVest sought</p> <p>6 more information regarding these facts.</p> <p>7 And then you've testified that they</p> <p>8 performed additional due diligence</p> <p>9 regarding that information they received,</p> <p>10 and then they determined that the</p> <p>11 investment was appropriate, correct?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>14 Go ahead, Mike.</p> <p>15 A. Yeah, that is correct, on the</p> <p>16 back of the additional information we</p> <p>17 received from Highland.</p> <p>18 And I would add, with, you know,</p> <p>19 with the benefit of external advisors and</p> <p>20 outside counsel reviewing those structural</p> <p>21 changes, as well.</p> <p>22 Q. All right. Thank you.</p> <p>23 Now, going back to your</p> <p>24 declaration, which we've marked as</p> <p>25 Exhibit 3, Paragraph 3 says that "The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 unaudited net asset value of HCLOF, as of</p> <p>3 August 31, 2020, was \$44,587,820."</p> <p>4 And is that a -- is that a book</p> <p>5 value, I guess?</p> <p>6 A. That is a fair market value, in</p> <p>7 accordance with the valuation policy of</p> <p>8 HCLOF.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you happen to know the net</p> <p>10 asset value of HCLOF as of February 1,</p> <p>11 2019? And I don't want an exact number, I</p> <p>12 just want an approximation.</p> <p>13 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know where I could get</p> <p>15 that information?</p> <p>16 A. Presumably from the Debtor.</p> <p>17 Q. We'll come back to this in a</p> <p>18 minute, but I'm going to --</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: I think we've</p> <p>20 been going about an hour, John, if we</p> <p>21 can take a quick break.</p> <p>22 MR. WILSON: Yeah, a break is</p> <p>23 fine.</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Actually,</p> <p>25 Mike...</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: I'm sorry? I</p> <p>3 didn't hear you.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: It can be up to</p> <p>5 Mike.</p> <p>6 Mike, do you want to take a</p> <p>7 quick break? Do you want to keep</p> <p>8 going?</p> <p>9 MR. WILSON: No, we can, if</p> <p>10 y'all need a break, we can take a</p> <p>11 break, like 10, 15 minutes.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, why don't we</p> <p>13 take a break, please.</p> <p>14 MR. WILSON: What do y'all</p> <p>15 prefer? 10, 15?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Ten minutes is</p> <p>17 fine.</p> <p>18 Mike, is that good with you.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Yeah, ten-minute</p> <p>20 break is fine.</p> <p>21 MR. WILSON: Okay. Well, we'll</p> <p>22 break till, let's say, 1:20 central</p> <p>23 time.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Perfect.</p> <p>25 MR. WILSON: All right. Thanks</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 guys.</p> <p>3 (Recess taken.)</p> <p>4 MR. WILSON: Yes, I just sent</p> <p>5 out an E-mail with Exhibit 6, and I'm</p> <p>6 going to pull that up on the screen</p> <p>7 share, as well.</p> <p>8 (Whereupon, Exhibit 6, Offering</p> <p>9 Memorandum 122 pages, was marked for</p> <p>10 identification.)</p> <p>11 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>12 Q. All right. So this is the</p> <p>13 Offering Memorandum, and I'm looking at</p> <p>14 the bottom of Page 1 -- I mean, the top of</p> <p>15 Page 1, I'm sorry.</p> <p>16 The Company that was being</p> <p>17 invested in is Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.</p> <p>18 Do you see that, Mr. Pugatch?</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>20 form.</p> <p>21 A. I do. Okay.</p> <p>22 Q. And then this document defines</p> <p>23 Highland, as Highland Capital Management,</p> <p>24 L.P. Do you see that?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Now, if we go down to, I</p> <p>3 guess it's Page 8 of this document, and</p> <p>4 this first full paragraph at the top, it</p> <p>5 says, "No voting member of the Advisory</p> <p>6 Board shall be a controlled affiliate of</p> <p>7 Highland."</p> <p>8 Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A. I do.</p> <p>10 Q. And then it also says that, "It</p> <p>11 being understood that none of CLO Holdco</p> <p>12 Ltd., it's wholly-owned subsidiaries, or</p> <p>13 any of their respective directors or</p> <p>14 trustees shall be deemed to be a</p> <p>15 controlled affiliate of Highland, due to</p> <p>16 their preexisting non-discretionary</p> <p>17 advisory relationship with Highland."</p> <p>18 Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So there were no affiliates of</p> <p>21 Highland on the Advisory Board, correct?</p> <p>22 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>23 form.</p> <p>24 A. For voting purposes under the</p> <p>25 document, that is how this reads, correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: All right. I'm</p> <p>3 going to turn to the next exhibit.</p> <p>4 And this is going to be Exhibit No. 7</p> <p>5 coming in the E-mail. I'm also going</p> <p>6 to put Exhibit No. 7 on the screen.</p> <p>7 (Whereupon, Exhibit 7, Share</p> <p>8 Subscription and Transfer Agreement 31</p> <p>9 pages, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>10 Q. All right. Do you see that?</p> <p>11 The "Subscription and Transfer Agreement</p> <p>12 For Ordinary Shares"?</p> <p>13 A. Yep.</p> <p>14 Q. All right. So what this</p> <p>15 document says is that, it repeats that</p> <p>16 Highland HCLF Advisory Ltd. is the</p> <p>17 portfolio manager. Highland CLO Funding</p> <p>18 Ltd. is the fund, and CLO Holdco Ltd. is</p> <p>19 the existing shareholder.</p> <p>20 And if we go down to the bottom</p> <p>21 half of this page, it says that</p> <p>22 HarbourVest was acquiring its shares in</p> <p>23 this investment from CLO Holdco, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form.</p> <p>3 Q. And prior to the date of this</p> <p>4 document, which I believe is November 15,</p> <p>5 2017, CLO Holdco held 100 percent of the</p> <p>6 shares of HCLOF, correct?</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>8 form, foundation.</p> <p>9 A. I don't recall. I know they</p> <p>10 were the largest, the largest investor. I</p> <p>11 don't recall if it was 100 percent.</p> <p>12 Q. Well, if you look at the chart</p> <p>13 below Paragraph A, it says that CLO Holdco</p> <p>14 Ltd. immediately prior to the placing on</p> <p>15 100 percent share percentage.</p> <p>16 Do you have any reason to</p> <p>17 disagree with that?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>20 form.</p> <p>21 Q. All right. Now, below CLO</p> <p>22 Holdco Ltd., these are the five</p> <p>23 HarbourVest entities that have filed</p> <p>24 proofs of claim in this bankruptcy,</p> <p>25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>3 form.</p> <p>4 A. Those are the five HarbourVest</p> <p>5 entities with a direct investment in</p> <p>6 HCLOF.</p> <p>7 Q. And each one of those entities</p> <p>8 has filed a proof of claim in this</p> <p>9 bankruptcy, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And the largest -- I think we</p> <p>12 discussed this earlier, but Dover Street</p> <p>13 IX is the largest of those investors, with</p> <p>14 a 35.49 percent share percentage, correct?</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>16 form.</p> <p>17 A. Correct.</p> <p>18 Q. And if you take the total of</p> <p>19 those investments of the HarbourVest</p> <p>20 entities, you get a 49.98 percent total.</p> <p>21 Is that your understanding?</p> <p>22 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>23 form.</p> <p>24 A. I know it has 49 percent, and</p> <p>25 some percentage. I'll take your math as</p>

<p>Page 66</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 correct.</p> <p>3 Q. And 49.98 percent is larger than</p> <p>4 the next largest shareholder, which is CLO</p> <p>5 Holdco which is 49.02 percent, correct?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. In taking all of the HarbourVest</p> <p>9 entities, collectively, yes, correct.</p> <p>10 Q. And so I want to go back to</p> <p>11 earlier where we saw in documents filed by</p> <p>12 HarbourVest, where it refers to itself as</p> <p>13 a passive investor. What do you, I</p> <p>14 apologize if I've already asked you this</p> <p>15 question, but what do you mean by passive</p> <p>16 investor?</p> <p>17 A. Meaning we were a minority</p> <p>18 investor in HCLOF. HCLOF was fully</p> <p>19 controlled by Highland as the investment</p> <p>20 manager. So HarbourVest did not have any</p> <p>21 governance, rights, or control as it</p> <p>22 related to the ongoing investment</p> <p>23 management and decisionmaking of HCLOF.</p> <p>24 Q. HarbourVest has the largest</p> <p>25 percentage of the shares of any of these</p>	<p>Page 67</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 investors, correct?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. Taken collectively, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And HarbourVest owned one of the</p> <p>7 two spots on the Advisory Board, correct?</p> <p>8 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And if you look down below the</p> <p>12 HarbourVest entities on this chart, you</p> <p>13 see that Highland Capital Management, L.P.</p> <p>14 is purchasing a .63 percent interest,</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form. The document speaks for itself.</p> <p>18 A. According to the document, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you have any reason to</p> <p>20 disagree with that document?</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 A. I do not.</p> <p>24 MR. WILSON: All right. I'm</p> <p>25 going to stop that screen share. I'm</p>
<p>Page 68</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 going to E-mail out the next exhibit.</p> <p>3 This was Exhibit 8 that I just sent,</p> <p>4 and I'll pull it up on the screen</p> <p>5 share.</p> <p>6 (Whereupon, Exhibit 8, E-mail</p> <p>7 08/15/2017, was marked for</p> <p>8 identification.)</p> <p>9 Q. Now, I'll represent to you that</p> <p>10 I received this document this morning from</p> <p>11 your counsel. Do you recognize this</p> <p>12 E-mail? Have you seen it before?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>14 Q. And this E-mail is sent by Brad</p> <p>15 Eden. I think you mentioned that he was</p> <p>16 one of the representatives that was</p> <p>17 involved in the pre-investment discussions</p> <p>18 with Highland?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And I think you told me that</p> <p>21 Dustin Willard was involved in those</p> <p>22 discussions on the HarbourVest side,</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. And so this is an E-mail sent on</p>	<p>Page 69</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 August 15, 2017 from Brad Eden to Dustin</p> <p>3 Willard. Are you familiar with Thomas</p> <p>4 Surgent?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Was he involved in those</p> <p>7 discussions with you and HarbourVest as</p> <p>8 well?</p> <p>9 A. In some of those discussions,</p> <p>10 yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So when it says, "Dustin,</p> <p>12 attached is a legal summary. Of course,</p> <p>13 Thomas is available to answer any</p> <p>14 follow-up questions." Do you know if</p> <p>15 Thomas was consulted with any follow-up</p> <p>16 questions?</p> <p>17 A. I recall --</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. -- having follow-up</p> <p>21 conversations with Highland, I don't --</p> <p>22 around these legal summaries. I don't</p> <p>23 recall with whom.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And just to show you the</p> <p>25 attachment that's referenced in the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 E-mail, this says that SEC financial</p> <p>3 crisis matter crusader, Terry, Daugherty</p> <p>4 and UBS. So and then I guess these are --</p> <p>5 this is information provided by Highland</p> <p>6 to HarbourVest regarding these matters.</p> <p>7 Why were these particular matters</p> <p>8 addressed in this E-mail, to your</p> <p>9 knowledge?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form and foundation.</p> <p>12 A. These were all outstanding</p> <p>13 litigation matters that we had become</p> <p>14 aware of in connection with our diligence</p> <p>15 that we asked for a further explanation</p> <p>16 from Highland on the underlying substance.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, did you become</p> <p>18 independently aware of these in the course</p> <p>19 of your due diligence, or were these</p> <p>20 brought to your attention by Highland</p> <p>21 first?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know.</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form.</p> <p>25 Q. You don't know?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. (Nods.)</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And particularly with</p> <p>4 respect to Mr. Terry, is it your opinion</p> <p>5 that there are any material</p> <p>6 misrepresentations made in this summary?</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>8 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>9 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>10 Mike, to the extent you have an</p> <p>11 answer that does not infringe on</p> <p>12 conversations with counsel, you can</p> <p>13 provide it.</p> <p>14 A. Yeah, I would say our</p> <p>15 understanding or interpretation of that,</p> <p>16 or the answer to that question would be</p> <p>17 based on conversations with counsel.</p> <p>18 Q. Well, this document was provided</p> <p>19 to you in the course of the discussions</p> <p>20 prior to HarbourVest's investment, and</p> <p>21 you've stated that Highland, or you've</p> <p>22 taken the position that Highland made</p> <p>23 material misrepresentations to</p> <p>24 HarbourVest, in the course of these</p> <p>25 discussions.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Does this document evidence</p> <p>3 those material misrepresentations?</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>5 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>6 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>7 A. Yeah, same answer as previous.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, I'm not asking you for a</p> <p>9 legal conclusion. I'm asking you are</p> <p>10 there misrepresentations in this document</p> <p>11 that you claim Highland made?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>13 objections.</p> <p>14 I think misrepresentations calls</p> <p>15 for a legal conclusion regarding legal</p> <p>16 misrepresentations, actionable</p> <p>17 misrepresentations. So if he doesn't</p> <p>18 have any non-privileged testimony to</p> <p>19 give, he can't give any testimony.</p> <p>20 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm here</p> <p>21 today to investigate HarbourVest's</p> <p>22 claim and one of the basis of</p> <p>23 HarbourVest's claim is</p> <p>24 misrepresentation. So I'm trying to</p> <p>25 figure out what those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 misrepresentations were.</p> <p>3 And I would ask that the witness</p> <p>4 tell me if there's a misrepresentation</p> <p>5 in this document that was provided in</p> <p>6 this E-mail.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>8 objections.</p> <p>9 Mike, if you have a general</p> <p>10 understanding of, generally,</p> <p>11 misrepresentations that HarbourVest</p> <p>12 believes were made in connection or</p> <p>13 regarding the Terry litigation,</p> <p>14 et cetera, you can provide that</p> <p>15 information.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Yeah, sure.</p> <p>17 A. So in general, my understanding</p> <p>18 and the way that Highland had</p> <p>19 characterized the ongoing litigation with</p> <p>20 Mr. Terry was that it was nothing more</p> <p>21 than an employment dispute with a former</p> <p>22 employee and that, you know, the</p> <p>23 arbitration -- well, actually, it was</p> <p>24 before the Arbitration Board, but the</p> <p>25 ongoing litigation had no impact, bearing,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 or ultimate result on the underlying CLOs</p> <p>3 that Highland managed, including the Acis</p> <p>4 CLOs.</p> <p>5 Q. So you're saying that</p> <p>6 Highland --</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: John, I'm sorry to</p> <p>8 interrupt. Before you go on, somebody</p> <p>9 with the initials DSD just joined the</p> <p>10 deposition. Can you please identify</p> <p>11 yourself?</p> <p>12 MR. DRAPER: This is Douglas</p> <p>13 Draper. I just changed machines.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Okay. No problem,</p> <p>15 Doug. Thank you.</p> <p>16 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>17 Q. So, and I'm not trying to put</p> <p>18 words in your mouth, but is the gist of</p> <p>19 what you're telling me that Highland</p> <p>20 represented that this was a minor dispute</p> <p>21 with a former employee and it would not</p> <p>22 affect its CLO business?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Well, are there any more</p> <p>4 specific E-mails or written</p> <p>5 communications, that you're aware of, that</p> <p>6 would contain misrepresentations by</p> <p>7 Highland to HarbourVest?</p> <p>8 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>9 form.</p> <p>10 Are you asking about from</p> <p>11 today's production, or are you asking</p> <p>12 about just, in general?</p> <p>13 MR. WILSON: Well, you produced</p> <p>14 two E-mails to us today. I'm just</p> <p>15 asking if there's anything else he's</p> <p>16 aware of where there's written</p> <p>17 misrepresentations from Highland to</p> <p>18 HarbourVest.</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Mike, if you</p> <p>20 have an answer separate from</p> <p>21 conversations with lawyers, et cetera,</p> <p>22 you can certainly answer.</p> <p>23 A. Yeah, my understanding of the</p> <p>24 documents I reviewed that were part of the</p> <p>25 production to you earlier today, there is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 another document that would also include</p> <p>3 misrepresentations on the part of this,</p> <p>4 the Terry lawsuit and ultimate impact on</p> <p>5 the CLO business.</p> <p>6 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>7 Q. And what document is that?</p> <p>8 A. That was the E-mail, E-mail with</p> <p>9 an attachment around a response to a Wall</p> <p>10 Street Journal article and some of the</p> <p>11 content in the E-mail itself.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. We'll look at that one.</p> <p>13 What was the -- HarbourVest had</p> <p>14 seen the Terry Arbitration Award, correct?</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>16 form.</p> <p>17 Q. Prior to making its investment</p> <p>18 in HCLOF?</p> <p>19 A. We were aware of the existence</p> <p>20 and the outcome of the Arbitration Award.</p> <p>21 Q. Had you read the Arbitration</p> <p>22 Award?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Well, how did you know the</p> <p>25 substance of the Arbitration Award without</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 reading it?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. We were informed by Highland of</p> <p>6 the outcome of the ongoing litigation and</p> <p>7 the outcome of the Arbitration Award.</p> <p>8 Q. Was that part of the</p> <p>9 documentation that you requested Highland</p> <p>10 provide you to continue your due</p> <p>11 diligence, before making the investment?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form.</p> <p>14 A. We certainly requested more</p> <p>15 color around the outcome of that, and any</p> <p>16 impact that it could have to HCLOF or the</p> <p>17 ongoing viability of Highland's CLO</p> <p>18 business.</p> <p>19 Q. And what, what were you provided</p> <p>20 with respect to the Terry Arbitration</p> <p>21 Award?</p> <p>22 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>23 form.</p> <p>24 A. The existence of that award, the</p> <p>25 quantum of that award, the judgment of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 just under \$8 million in connection with</p> <p>3 that award. That was the information that</p> <p>4 was disclosed at -- and represented as a</p> <p>5 settlement or, you know, arbitration</p> <p>6 ruling, in connection with the employee</p> <p>7 litigation, wrongful termination suit.</p> <p>8 Q. So did HarbourVest not request a</p> <p>9 copy of the Arbitration Award to review?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form.</p> <p>12 A. We did not specifically, no.</p> <p>13 Q. And so, to this day, have you</p> <p>14 read the Arbitration Award?</p> <p>15 A. I have not.</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 Q. You have not?</p> <p>19 A. I have not.</p> <p>20 MR. WILSON: Okay. I think my</p> <p>21 last E-mail went out with Exhibit 9 on</p> <p>22 it. I will pull that up.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you see that on the screen</p> <p>24 share?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 (Whereupon, Exhibit 9,</p> <p>3 11/29/2017 E-mail with cover letter</p> <p>4 Highland Capital Management, was</p> <p>5 marked for identification.)</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. So I think this is out of</p> <p>7 order, but this should have been first in</p> <p>8 the exhibit. But this is an E-mail from</p> <p>9 Hunter Covitz to Dustin Willard, Michael</p> <p>10 Pugatch and Nick Bellisario, carbon copies</p> <p>11 to Trey Parker and Brad Eden.</p> <p>12 And Trey Parker and Brad Eden</p> <p>13 are Highland affiliates, right?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And we've talked about Dustin</p> <p>16 Willard. Who's Nick Bellisario?</p> <p>17 A. He was another member of the</p> <p>18 HarbourVest team.</p> <p>19 Q. And was he on the, the</p> <p>20 four-member board that you talked about</p> <p>21 earlier, that made the investment</p> <p>22 decision?</p> <p>23 A. No, he was the junior member of</p> <p>24 the investment team that I alluded to.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And this, this E-mail</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 came out about two weeks after the</p> <p>3 HarbourVest investment, correct?</p> <p>4 A. Correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And it's your opinion or</p> <p>6 position that this E-mail contains</p> <p>7 misrepresentations that Highland made to</p> <p>8 HarbourVest?</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>10 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>11 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And there was a Wall Street</p> <p>14 Journal article that had come out shortly</p> <p>15 before this E-mail, correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And how did you became aware of</p> <p>18 that Wall Street Journal article?</p> <p>19 A. I certainly would have seen it.</p> <p>20 I may have been sent it separately by</p> <p>21 Highland, I don't recall.</p> <p>22 Q. You don't recall if you saw it</p> <p>23 independently or Highland telling you</p> <p>24 about it?</p> <p>25 A. I don't.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. And what did you -- what was</p> <p>3 your reaction to receiving these E-mails</p> <p>4 from Highland regarding that article?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form.</p> <p>7 A. The article or the accusations</p> <p>8 in the article were something that</p> <p>9 required more explanation from our</p> <p>10 perspective.</p> <p>11 Q. And attached to this E-mail</p> <p>12 was -- we just scrolled through it a</p> <p>13 second ago -- but a letter from James</p> <p>14 Dondero that was sent to the</p> <p>15 editor-in-chief of the Wall Street</p> <p>16 Journal, Mr. Gerard Baker, on November</p> <p>17 28th.</p> <p>18 And did you read this</p> <p>19 attachment?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And did this attachment to this</p> <p>22 E-mail aleve your concerns that you had</p> <p>23 regarding the article?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. I wouldn't say alleviated the</p> <p>3 concerns but certainly provided an</p> <p>4 explanation or refute to some of the</p> <p>5 claims made in the, in the article.</p> <p>6 Q. And do you contend that this</p> <p>7 letter that was written to Gerard Baker</p> <p>8 and provided later to HarbourVest was a</p> <p>9 material misrepresentation?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form.</p> <p>12 Don't answer that, Mike. It</p> <p>13 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>14 MR. WILSON: I'm asking for his</p> <p>15 understanding.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you contend that there's</p> <p>17 misrepresentations in this letter?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Material</p> <p>19 misrepresentations absolutely calls</p> <p>20 for a legal conclusion, John.</p> <p>21 MR. WILSON: Well, I've</p> <p>22 shortened it to misrepresentations.</p> <p>23 So I just want to know if he thinks</p> <p>24 there's anything that's misrepresented</p> <p>25 in this letter.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>3 objections.</p> <p>4 Mike, if you have an</p> <p>5 understanding, separate from</p> <p>6 conversations with lawyers, you can</p> <p>7 answer.</p> <p>8 A. I would need to reread the</p> <p>9 letter to definitively answer that outside</p> <p>10 of conversations with counsel.</p> <p>11 Q. But to be clear, this letter was</p> <p>12 issued two weeks after HarbourVest's</p> <p>13 investment, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection;</p> <p>16 asked and answered.</p> <p>17 MR. WILSON: I'm going to now</p> <p>18 send out the next exhibit, which is</p> <p>19 going to be Exhibit No. 10.</p> <p>20 (Whereupon, Exhibit 10, 2004</p> <p>21 Examination of Investor in Highland</p> <p>22 CLO Funding Ltd. 10/10/2018, was</p> <p>23 marked for identification.)</p> <p>24 MR. WILSON: It just went</p> <p>25 through. So I'm going to pull it up</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 on my screen share.</p> <p>3 So this Exhibit 10, the document</p> <p>4 I received this morning, filed in the</p> <p>5 Acis bankruptcy, it looks like, well,</p> <p>6 let's see, dated in, dated October 10,</p> <p>7 2018.</p> <p>8 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>9 Q. Have you seen this document</p> <p>10 before?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And it's a motion for 2004</p> <p>13 Examination of Investor in Highland CLO</p> <p>14 Funding, Ltd., correct?</p> <p>15 A. Sorry. Was there a question,</p> <p>16 John?</p> <p>17 Q. Yeah. I was just asking you to</p> <p>18 confirm that this was the motion for 2004</p> <p>19 Examination of Investor in Highland CLO</p> <p>20 Funding?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And so if I scroll down to</p> <p>23 Paragraph 6, which is on, it looks like</p> <p>24 it's on Page 4. In the second sentence,</p> <p>25 it says that "Although HCLOF/ALF was a one</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 time wholly-owned by an affiliate of</p> <p>3 Highland, it did an offering memorandum in</p> <p>4 November of 2017 and as a result, is now</p> <p>5 owned 49.985% by certain affiliates of a</p> <p>6 large investor and manager of private</p> <p>7 equity funds."</p> <p>8 And that's defined as investor.</p> <p>9 So the Investor is the HarbourVest</p> <p>10 entities collectively, correct?</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 Q. All right. And then the next</p> <p>13 sentence, says that "Despite its large</p> <p>14 ownership percentage in HCLOF in the</p> <p>15 alleged millions in losses that will</p> <p>16 result if the Acis CLOs are not reset to</p> <p>17 make them consistent with prevailing</p> <p>18 market conditions the Investor has not yet</p> <p>19 appeared in this case or taken any</p> <p>20 position in this bankruptcy case."</p> <p>21 Do you see that?</p> <p>22 A. I do.</p> <p>23 Q. Is that correct?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Is what correct?</p> <p>3 Q. Well, I guess, I'm most</p> <p>4 concerned with this last part of the</p> <p>5 sentence. It starts with "The Investor</p> <p>6 has not yet appeared in this case or taken</p> <p>7 any position in the bankruptcy case."</p> <p>8 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>10 form.</p> <p>11 Mike, if you want to look at the</p> <p>12 whole document, you're welcome to.</p> <p>13 This is not a document that's a</p> <p>14 HarbourVest-prepared document.</p> <p>15 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>16 Q. Maybe a better way of asking the</p> <p>17 question is: As of the date of this</p> <p>18 document, which was in October of 2018,</p> <p>19 had HarbourVest appeared in the Acis</p> <p>20 bankruptcy?</p> <p>21 A. No, we did not.</p> <p>22 Q. And had they asserted any</p> <p>23 positions regarding the Acis bankruptcy?</p> <p>24 A. Not through the court.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Had Highland encouraged</p> <p>4 HarbourVest to participate in the Acis</p> <p>5 bankruptcy?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. They did not?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form.</p> <p>12 Q. Highland did not encourage</p> <p>13 HarbourVest to participate in the Acis</p> <p>14 bankruptcy?</p> <p>15 A. When you say "participate," can</p> <p>16 you define that, please.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, appear in the case, as</p> <p>18 stated in this motion.</p> <p>19 A. No, they had not.</p> <p>20 Q. Did Harbour -- I'm sorry -- did</p> <p>21 Highland keep HarbourVest apprised of the</p> <p>22 events that occurred in the Acis</p> <p>23 bankruptcy?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form. I'm just going to restate my</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 objection to the extent you're asking</p> <p>3 questions about HarbourVest. This is</p> <p>4 Mr. Pugatch answering, based on his</p> <p>5 knowledge.</p> <p>6 A. We were kept informed from time</p> <p>7 to time throughout the Acis bankruptcy</p> <p>8 proceeding.</p> <p>9 Q. Well, did you, in fact, have</p> <p>10 weekly conference calls with Highland</p> <p>11 representatives regarding the Acis</p> <p>12 bankruptcy?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>14 form.</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall them being</p> <p>16 weekly, no.</p> <p>17 Q. You can agree with me you</p> <p>18 participated in the conference calls with</p> <p>19 Highland regarding the Acis bankruptcy?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>22 Q. And on what, on what --</p> <p>23 MR. WILSON: Sorry. Strike</p> <p>24 that.</p> <p>25 Q. With what regularity would you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 estimate those conference calls occurred,</p> <p>3 if it's not weekly?</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>5 form.</p> <p>6 A. From memory, maybe once, once a</p> <p>7 month on average. Sometimes more</p> <p>8 frequently, sometimes less frequently.</p> <p>9 Q. Did Highland provide you with</p> <p>10 documents and evidence that were filed in</p> <p>11 the Acis bankruptcy?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form.</p> <p>14 We're really starting to get</p> <p>15 pretty far afield here, John, from</p> <p>16 HarbourVest. You know, I'm not sure</p> <p>17 where you're going with this. This is</p> <p>18 a settlement motion that's teed up for</p> <p>19 the court.</p> <p>20 You're welcome to keep going,</p> <p>21 but at some point we're going to cut</p> <p>22 it off.</p> <p>23 MR. WILSON: Well, I think -- I</p> <p>24 don't think I'm going to go too far</p> <p>25 down this path, but I think this</p>

<p>Page 90</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 directly relates to the claims that</p> <p>3 HarbourVest has made. But I'll repeat</p> <p>4 my question.</p> <p>5 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>6 Q. Did Highland provide HarbourVest</p> <p>7 with documents and evidence that were</p> <p>8 filed in the Acis bankruptcy?</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>10 form.</p> <p>11 A. I don't recall what documents</p> <p>12 Highland may have provided to us, at that</p> <p>13 point in time.</p> <p>14 Q. I don't want you to recall</p> <p>15 specific documents that were provided, but</p> <p>16 did, did Highland provide documents from</p> <p>17 the Acis bankruptcy to HarbourVest?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form. Asked and answered.</p> <p>20 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>21 Q. You don't recall?</p> <p>22 A. (Nods.)</p> <p>23 Q. Would you dispute that between</p> <p>24 2018 and 2019 that Highland provided over</p> <p>25 40,000 pages of documents related to the</p>	<p>Page 91</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Acis bankruptcy to HarbourVest?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form, foundation.</p> <p>5 A. I don't know and I don't recall.</p> <p>6 Q. And the Acis plan became</p> <p>7 effective on February 1st, 2019. Is that</p> <p>8 your understanding?</p> <p>9 A. I believe so, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And do you -- I asked you this</p> <p>11 earlier, but I'm going to ask again. Do</p> <p>12 you have any understanding of what the</p> <p>13 value of HCLOF was, at that date?</p> <p>14 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>16 form.</p> <p>17 Q. You don't?</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall, no.</p> <p>19 Q. And there was an injunction put</p> <p>20 in place in the Acis bankruptcy that</p> <p>21 prevented certain actions with respect to</p> <p>22 HCLOF, correct?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form, foundation.</p> <p>25 MR. MALONEY: Join.</p>
<p>Page 92</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Now, I'm going to go back up to</p> <p>4 Paragraph 2. This says that Acis LP</p> <p>5 manages the Acis CLOs, that certain</p> <p>6 portfolio management agreement between</p> <p>7 Acis, and then it goes on. So what are</p> <p>8 the Acis CLOs, as it relates to the</p> <p>9 investment that HarbourVest made?</p> <p>10 MR. MALONEY: Objection to the</p> <p>11 form of the question.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form.</p> <p>14 A. The Acis CLOs -- or HCLOF owned</p> <p>15 equity in certain of the Acis CLOs as a</p> <p>16 portion of its investment portfolio.</p> <p>17 Q. And I think you were trying to</p> <p>18 distinguish earlier between who the</p> <p>19 portfolio manager was. And that would</p> <p>20 depend on whether it was an Acis CLO or a</p> <p>21 Highland CLO; is that correct?</p> <p>22 MR. MALONEY: Objection to form.</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form, misstates testimony.</p> <p>25 A. I was referencing the portfolio</p>	<p>Page 93</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 manager of the underlying CLOs, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. But we can agree that Acis had</p> <p>4 responsibility for managing at least a</p> <p>5 portion of HCLOF, correct?</p> <p>6 A. Highland --</p> <p>7 MR. WILSON: Objection to form.</p> <p>8 MR. MALONEY: Objection to form</p> <p>9 as well, foundation, and legal</p> <p>10 conclusion.</p> <p>11 (Reporter clarification.)</p> <p>12 A. It's my understanding it's</p> <p>13 Highlands' subsidiaries, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to go</p> <p>15 down to Paragraph 4, at the top of your</p> <p>16 screen here where it says, "Recently</p> <p>17 William Scott, the director of HCLOF,</p> <p>18 testified that he wants to reset the Acis</p> <p>19 CLOs to bring them in line with current</p> <p>20 market interest rates, that the inability</p> <p>21 to do the reset is causing damages to</p> <p>22 HCLOF in the amount of approximately</p> <p>23 \$295,000 per week."</p> <p>24 Is that an accurate statement?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form and foundation.</p> <p>3 MR. MALONEY: Mark Maloney.</p> <p>4 Object to form and foundation.</p> <p>5 A. I don't know. You'd have to ask</p> <p>6 William Scott.</p> <p>7 Q. Well, were you aware, I mean,</p> <p>8 there's a citation to a, well, I don't</p> <p>9 know if there's a citation on this one.</p> <p>10 But it says that he recently testified.</p> <p>11 Were you aware that he testified that he</p> <p>12 wanted to reset the Acis CLOs?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>14 We're really getting far afield.</p> <p>15 MR. WILSON: I'm just asking if</p> <p>16 he was aware that this statement</p> <p>17 occurred.</p> <p>18 A. At some point in time, yes, I</p> <p>19 became aware of that.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Do you agree that the</p> <p>21 inability to do a reset was causing</p> <p>22 damages in the amount of \$295,000 per</p> <p>23 week?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form and foundation. This is not a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 HarbourVest-prepared document.</p> <p>3 MR. WILSON: Well, I understand</p> <p>4 that. I'm just asking if he agrees</p> <p>5 with it.</p> <p>6 A. I don't have enough information</p> <p>7 to assess that, specifically the \$295,000</p> <p>8 per week number.</p> <p>9 Q. I want to go down to Paragraph 7</p> <p>10 of this document, and this is going to be</p> <p>11 at the top of Page 5. It says</p> <p>12 "Mr. Ellington also testified that because</p> <p>13 it would be putting in additional capital</p> <p>14 in connection with any reset CLOs, the</p> <p>15 Investor," and we discussed that that's</p> <p>16 HarbourVest, "had the ability to start</p> <p>17 'calling the shots' and dictate the terms</p> <p>18 of any reset transactions."</p> <p>19 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>22 form.</p> <p>23 Q. I want to go down to Paragraph</p> <p>24 9.</p> <p>25 It says, "The Trustee also needs</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 information regarding whether the Investor</p> <p>3 presently has any concerns about pursuing</p> <p>4 reset transactions with the Reorganized</p> <p>5 Acis and Brigade, under the plan now that</p> <p>6 Acis has been able to successfully serve</p> <p>7 as the portfolio manager for the Acis CLOs</p> <p>8 on a post-petition basis, and there are no</p> <p>9 impediments to the ability of the</p> <p>10 Reorganized Acis and Brigade to pursue a</p> <p>11 reset on the Acis CLOs."</p> <p>12 Do you know whether the Investor</p> <p>13 had any concerns about pursuing a reset?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form, foundation.</p> <p>16 A. The context of a reset or</p> <p>17 refinancing of the various CLOs in HCLOF</p> <p>18 was part of the original investment</p> <p>19 thesis. So there would not have been</p> <p>20 concerns about the ability to do so. Our</p> <p>21 concerns were more in the inability to do</p> <p>22 so, as a result of the Acis bankruptcy.</p> <p>23 Q. But here, you've got the Trustee</p> <p>24 representing in Paragraph 5, that</p> <p>25 according to the Trustee's Second Amended</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Joint Plan, it provides for such a reset</p> <p>3 to be performed by the Reorganized Acis</p> <p>4 and supervised by Brigade Capital</p> <p>5 Management.</p> <p>6 And it appears to me that the</p> <p>7 Trustee is trying to get the Investor's</p> <p>8 position on whether a reset should be</p> <p>9 pursued. And I'm just asking you whether</p> <p>10 HarbourVest objected to a reset at this</p> <p>11 time?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm going to</p> <p>13 object to all of the colloquy before.</p> <p>14 I'm going to object to any extent</p> <p>15 Mike's being asked about what the</p> <p>16 Trustee wanted or viewed. If you want</p> <p>17 to ask your question in isolation, go</p> <p>18 ahead.</p> <p>19 Q. What was HarbourVest's position</p> <p>20 regarding a reset, as of the date that</p> <p>21 this was filed, and I'll look again,</p> <p>22 October 10, 2018?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form. Objection to the extent it's</p> <p>25 asking HarbourVest's position. And I</p>

<p>Page 98</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 cannot conceive how this is relevant</p> <p>3 to the 9019 motion before the court</p> <p>4 right now.</p> <p>5 Nonetheless, Mike, if you have</p> <p>6 an answer, on behalf of yourself, you</p> <p>7 can answer.</p> <p>8 A. HarbourVest was a passive</p> <p>9 minority investor in HCLOF. It had no</p> <p>10 ability to control the underlying</p> <p>11 portfolio management or ability to reset,</p> <p>12 refinance, or call in any of the equity of</p> <p>13 the underlying CLOs. That was all under</p> <p>14 the purview of Highland.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you understand that</p> <p>16 Mr. Ellington had given sworn testimony</p> <p>17 that the Investor is the party calling the</p> <p>18 shots for HCLOF, with respect to any reset</p> <p>19 transactions?</p> <p>20 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>21 form.</p> <p>22 A. I did become aware of it, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. When did you become aware of</p> <p>24 that?</p> <p>25 A. At some point subsequent to that</p>	<p>Page 99</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 testimony being given.</p> <p>3 Q. But was it when you read this</p> <p>4 motion that we're looking at as</p> <p>5 Exhibit 10?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>7 form.</p> <p>8 A. It may have been. I don't</p> <p>9 recall the exact time or medium that I</p> <p>10 became aware of that.</p> <p>11 Q. Was a deposition given as a</p> <p>12 result of this motion?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>14 form. If you have the whole document,</p> <p>15 Mike, that may make sense.</p> <p>16 MR. WILSON: Well, this motion</p> <p>17 at the top says it's a Motion for 2004</p> <p>18 Examination of Investor. And then</p> <p>19 attached to this motion are some</p> <p>20 document requests, and then deposition</p> <p>21 topics for a corporate representative</p> <p>22 of the Investor, and then a proposed</p> <p>23 order.</p> <p>24 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall whether a</p>
<p>Page 100</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 deposition was given, after this motion</p> <p>3 was filed?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And who was the designated</p> <p>6 deponent?</p> <p>7 A. I was.</p> <p>8 Q. And were documents produced, as</p> <p>9 a result of this?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, there were.</p> <p>11 Q. And were you asked at that</p> <p>12 deposition what the Investor's position on</p> <p>13 a reset was?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form.</p> <p>16 If you recall.</p> <p>17 A. I don't recall specifically that</p> <p>18 question being asked.</p> <p>19 Q. Well, do you know what</p> <p>20 the Debtor's position -- I'm sorry, the</p> <p>21 Debtor's -- the Investor's position on a</p> <p>22 reset was as of that day?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form. Asked and answered.</p> <p>25 A. I would just say again, in</p>	<p>Page 101</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 general, the original investment thesis</p> <p>3 here was predicated on a refinancing reset</p> <p>4 of the various CLOs, and we were not in</p> <p>5 control as a passive minority investor</p> <p>6 here to --</p> <p>7 Q. Well, you said you weren't in</p> <p>8 control, but what would HarbourVest's</p> <p>9 preference have been?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form.</p> <p>12 A. I do not recall.</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: If you recall.</p> <p>14 A. I don't recall the specifics</p> <p>15 around what Acis CLO were referring to</p> <p>16 here or what the specific implications of</p> <p>17 a reset were at that time; but regardless,</p> <p>18 that was a decision for the investment</p> <p>19 manager of HCLO.</p> <p>20 Q. But was it your opinion, your</p> <p>21 personal opinion, that a reset was</p> <p>22 appropriate?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form.</p> <p>25 A. Again, we were not the portfolio</p>

<p>Page 102</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 manager of HCLOF. We were not in control</p> <p>3 of those decisions or making</p> <p>4 recommendations on those decisions. That</p> <p>5 was the delegated authority of Highland,</p> <p>6 as the investment manager.</p> <p>7 Q. I'm not asking for that. I'm</p> <p>8 asking for your personal feelings toward a</p> <p>9 reset.</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>11 He's only answering on behalf of</p> <p>12 himself, and it's been asked and</p> <p>13 answered three times since.</p> <p>14 MR. WILSON: Well, he hasn't</p> <p>15 answered the question. He's just told</p> <p>16 me they don't have the authority to do</p> <p>17 the reset.</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: And he told you</p> <p>19 the other information he'd be required</p> <p>20 to even have an opinion on it. So</p> <p>21 same objection stands. It's not a</p> <p>22 specific enough question for him.</p> <p>23 Mike, you're welcome, if you</p> <p>24 have, if you have an answer, you're</p> <p>25 welcome to give it.</p>	<p>Page 103</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. Yeah, the investment guidelines</p> <p>3 of HCLOF, from the documents that we</p> <p>4 signed at the time we entered into the</p> <p>5 transaction, laid out the specific, again,</p> <p>6 investment guidelines that HCLOF would be</p> <p>7 guided under, including the opportunity to</p> <p>8 refinance or reset various CLOs over time,</p> <p>9 in accordance with Highland's, you know,</p> <p>10 expectations and ultimate decision to do</p> <p>11 so.</p> <p>12 Q. But did you believe, at this</p> <p>13 time, that a reset was appropriate?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form. This is asked and answered</p> <p>16 several times now, I think we should</p> <p>17 move on. He's given you an answer.</p> <p>18 MR. WILSON: Well, I want to</p> <p>19 know what his personal opinion was</p> <p>20 about whether the reset was</p> <p>21 appropriate.</p> <p>22 A. What reset are you referring to?</p> <p>23 Q. A reset as of October 10, 2018.</p> <p>24 At that time, did you believe that a reset</p> <p>25 was appropriate?</p>
<p>Page 104</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. A reset of what?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>4 Q. A reset as been discussed all</p> <p>5 through this motion, the same reset we're</p> <p>6 talking about.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>8 Same objections. I just don't see how</p> <p>9 he could possibly answer this vague</p> <p>10 question.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So William Scott,</p> <p>12 director of HCLOF, testified that he</p> <p>13 wanted to reset the Acis CLOs because if</p> <p>14 they don't, they are losing \$295,000 a</p> <p>15 week.</p> <p>16 Did you think that a reset was</p> <p>17 appropriate in line with what Mr. Scott</p> <p>18 believed?</p> <p>19 MR. MALONEY: Objection to form,</p> <p>20 foundation.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>22 objections. And asked and answered</p> <p>23 numerous times.</p> <p>24 A. We were not managing the</p> <p>25 portfolio. We were an investor in a</p>	<p>Page 105</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 company, an investment company that was</p> <p>3 managing this. We were not, I was not</p> <p>4 proximate enough to any of the underlying</p> <p>5 happenings of the look through CLO</p> <p>6 positions of HCLOF to have an informed</p> <p>7 view on this, at this time.</p> <p>8 Q. Is your testimony that you did</p> <p>9 not have an opinion as to whether the Acis</p> <p>10 CLO should be reset in late 2018?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>12 form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>13 A. My view is that the original</p> <p>14 investment guidelines here called for a</p> <p>15 reset or refinance of the CLOs and that</p> <p>16 Highland was subsequently in full control</p> <p>17 of whether or not to pursue this, and we,</p> <p>18 HarbourVest, as an investor had no ability</p> <p>19 to object or to force that on a go-forward</p> <p>20 basis.</p> <p>21 MR. WILSON: Objection.</p> <p>22 Nonresponsive.</p> <p>23 Q. I want to know your personal</p> <p>24 opinion of whether you thought a reset was</p> <p>25 appropriate in October of 2018.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>3 form of the question. That's been</p> <p>4 asked and answered.</p> <p>5 MR. WILSON: He has yet to give</p> <p>6 his answer to --</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: He just told you he</p> <p>8 didn't have enough information. He</p> <p>9 just told you that, crystal clear.</p> <p>10 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm not going</p> <p>11 to argue with you, John, but I just</p> <p>12 want an answer to my question.</p> <p>13 His answer, he wouldn't agree</p> <p>14 with my, with my summation that he had</p> <p>15 no opinion, so I just want to know</p> <p>16 what his opinion is.</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>18 objections.</p> <p>19 You're not giving him enough</p> <p>20 information to answer the question,</p> <p>21 and at this point, it would be</p> <p>22 speculation. We can just keep going</p> <p>23 in circles on this, but your --</p> <p>24 MR. WILSON: His opinion would</p> <p>25 be speculation?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: He said that,</p> <p>3 he actually testified at some point</p> <p>4 that he doesn't recall specifics of</p> <p>5 the time, so that was another piece of</p> <p>6 the puzzle.</p> <p>7 I mean, I don't want to be</p> <p>8 coaching the witness or giving</p> <p>9 testimony here, but I think you're not</p> <p>10 listening to the things he's saying,</p> <p>11 John, just because you don't like it.</p> <p>12 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>13 Q. Mr. Pugatch, did you have an</p> <p>14 opinion, in October of 2019, about whether</p> <p>15 the Acis CLOs should be reset?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form.</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall any definitive</p> <p>19 opinion I would have had, but as stated,</p> <p>20 was not proximate enough to have an</p> <p>21 informed opinion, in any event.</p> <p>22 Q. And to your knowledge, have the</p> <p>23 Acis CLOs ever been reset?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form, foundation.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. I do not believe that any of the</p> <p>3 Acis CLOs were ever reset.</p> <p>4 Q. All right. So who negotiated</p> <p>5 this claim, the settlement of this claim</p> <p>6 on behalf of HarbourVest?</p> <p>7 A. I did.</p> <p>8 Q. And who negotiated for the</p> <p>9 Debtor?</p> <p>10 A. Jim Seery.</p> <p>11 Q. And when did those negotiations</p> <p>12 begin?</p> <p>13 A. It started sometime in November,</p> <p>14 I believe.</p> <p>15 Q. And are you aware that Jim Seery</p> <p>16 has ever taken the position that the</p> <p>17 HarbourVest claim was worthless?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form, foundation.</p> <p>20 A. No, I'm not aware of that.</p> <p>21 Q. Has Jim Seery ever offered</p> <p>22 \$5 million to settle the HarbourVest</p> <p>23 claim?</p> <p>24 A. Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form.</p> <p>3 MR. WILSON: I'm going to send</p> <p>4 out Exhibit 11.</p> <p>5 (Whereupon, Exhibit 11,</p> <p>6 Declaration of John A. Morris in</p> <p>7 Support of the Debtor'S Motion For</p> <p>8 Entry of an Order Approving Settlement</p> <p>9 With Harbourvest (Claim Nos. 143, 147,</p> <p>10 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing</p> <p>11 Actions, 82 pages, was marked for</p> <p>12 identification.)</p> <p>13 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>14 Q. I want pull this up on the</p> <p>15 screen share. This Exhibit 11 is the</p> <p>16 Declaration of John Morris in Support of</p> <p>17 the Debtor's 9019 Motion, bears</p> <p>18 Document 1631. And attached to this</p> <p>19 exhibit is a trim cut copy of the</p> <p>20 Settlement Agreement executed December 23,</p> <p>21 2020.</p> <p>22 And the Settlement Agreement has</p> <p>23 Paragraph 1, Settlement of Claims, that</p> <p>24 HarbourVest is going to receive a</p> <p>25 \$45 million unsecured, general unsecured</p>

<p>Page 110</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 claim, and a \$35 million subordinated</p> <p>3 claim.</p> <p>4 And then Part B of that</p> <p>5 paragraph states that HarbourVest is going</p> <p>6 to transfer all its rights, titles, and</p> <p>7 interests to its investment in CLOF to the</p> <p>8 Debtor or its nominee.</p> <p>9 Is that your understanding of</p> <p>10 the general terms of this settlement?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>12 form.</p> <p>13 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And also in Paragraph 5,</p> <p>15 Each HarbourVest party agrees that it will</p> <p>16 vote all of HarbourVest claims held by</p> <p>17 such HarbourVest party to accept the plan.</p> <p>18 And I won't read all of that.</p> <p>19 But the gist of this paragraph is that</p> <p>20 HarbourVest is going to vote for the</p> <p>21 Debtor's proposed plan; is that correct?</p> <p>22 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>23 form.</p> <p>24 A. Yes, correct.</p> <p>25 Q. And how did that term come to be</p>	<p>Page 111</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 in this Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. I believe it was put there as</p> <p>6 part of the drafting of the ultimate</p> <p>7 agreement to the fund.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, whose suggestion was it</p> <p>9 that it be added to the drafting?</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form.</p> <p>12 A. I believe that it came from</p> <p>13 Debtor's counsel, as they took the lead on</p> <p>14 drafting the documentation here.</p> <p>15 Q. Did Jim Seery ever tell you that</p> <p>16 it was important to him that HarbourVest</p> <p>17 vote in support of the plan?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. I don't recall that ever being</p> <p>21 discussed. Certainly it was not the</p> <p>22 prominent feature of any of the</p> <p>23 discussions or negotiations that I ever</p> <p>24 had with Jim.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p>
<p>Page 112</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: I'm going to take a</p> <p>3 ten-minute break, and I think I'm</p> <p>4 almost ready to wrap up. So I want to</p> <p>5 stop my screen share. And let's,</p> <p>6 well, let's start back at 2:30, and I</p> <p>7 think I'll be quick. Thank you.</p> <p>8 (Recess taken.)</p> <p>9 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>10 Q. Mr. Pugatch, earlier you</p> <p>11 testified that consistent with your</p> <p>12 declaration you filed that as of August</p> <p>13 31, 2020, the value of HCLOF was</p> <p>14 \$44.5 million. And then if we look at --</p> <p>15 I don't remember which --</p> <p>16 Okay. So this would have been</p> <p>17 Exhibit 7. I'll do a share screen.</p> <p>18 As of November 15, 2017 these</p> <p>19 shares were purchased at \$1.02 and change</p> <p>20 apiece, and there were a total number of</p> <p>21 143 million shares.</p> <p>22 Was the value of this investment</p> <p>23 roughly \$150 million, as of November 15,</p> <p>24 2017?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p>Page 113</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form. Foundation.</p> <p>3 MR. MALONEY: Join.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: I don't know,</p> <p>5 Mike, if you're comfortable doing that</p> <p>6 math or what.</p> <p>7 A. Yes, approximately that's</p> <p>8 correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And you know, and I've</p> <p>10 read your papers and you talk about</p> <p>11 attorneys' fees that you say weren't</p> <p>12 appropriate to be charged to HCLOF and</p> <p>13 that part of it, but as to the loss of</p> <p>14 value of the actual investment, what's</p> <p>15 your understanding of what led to that?</p> <p>16 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>17 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>18 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>19 Mike, to the extent you have a</p> <p>20 nonlegal opinion on that, that's not</p> <p>21 based on conversations with counsel,</p> <p>22 you can answer.</p> <p>23 A. Yeah, I think a lot of the value</p> <p>24 erosion was due to the inability to</p> <p>25 refinance, reset a number of the</p>

<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 underlying CLOs that was part of the</p> <p>3 original investment thesis here, largely</p> <p>4 as a result of the ongoing litigation,</p> <p>5 that Highland was involved in, and the</p> <p>6 subsequent Acis bankruptcy.</p> <p>7 Q. And so during the period of time</p> <p>8 when the injunction prohibited certain</p> <p>9 actions with respect to this investment,</p> <p>10 is it your opinion that this investment</p> <p>11 was losing value?</p> <p>12 MR. MALONEY: Objection.</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>14 form.</p> <p>15 A. Can you repeat the question,</p> <p>16 John?</p> <p>17 Q. Well, I guess I want to know,</p> <p>18 like, in a, on a timeline kind of basis,</p> <p>19 do you think that the significant</p> <p>20 reduction of value occurred prior to or</p> <p>21 after the confirmation of the Acis plan on</p> <p>22 February 1, 2019?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>25 calls for a legal conclusion.</p>	<p>Page 115</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 You can give your lay opinion,</p> <p>3 if you have one, Mike.</p> <p>4 A. I think it's all been as a</p> <p>5 result of the events leading up to the</p> <p>6 Acis bankruptcy, including the inability</p> <p>7 to refinance or reset the CLOs which would</p> <p>8 have been to the benefit of the CLO equity</p> <p>9 holders including HCLOF.</p> <p>10 Q. And so what, what was the cause</p> <p>11 of the inability to reset?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>13 objections: form, foundation, legal</p> <p>14 conclusion.</p> <p>15 If you have a non-privileged</p> <p>16 answer, Mike, go ahead.</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, my understanding was</p> <p>18 originally the TRO, preventing Highland</p> <p>19 and HCLOF from pursuing that, and then</p> <p>20 subsequent to the Acis bankruptcy ruling,</p> <p>21 a similar injunction that remained around</p> <p>22 the inability for the equity holders of</p> <p>23 those CLOs to redeem or refinance or</p> <p>24 reset.</p> <p>25 Q. So do you -- is there any</p>
<p>Page 116</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 component, in your opinion, of the loss of</p> <p>3 value of these investments due to</p> <p>4 portfolio mismanagement?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form, foundation, legal conclusion, or</p> <p>7 expert opinion, calling for</p> <p>8 speculation.</p> <p>9 If you have a view, Mike.</p> <p>10 A. Yeah. Can you be more specific</p> <p>11 with the question, John?</p> <p>12 Q. Well, I'll ask it a different</p> <p>13 way.</p> <p>14 Do you think that portfolio</p> <p>15 mismanagement was a portion of the cause</p> <p>16 of the reduction in value?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>18 A. I can't speculate as to, you</p> <p>19 know, the underlying management decisions</p> <p>20 around the CLOs, but what I do know is</p> <p>21 that the mismanagement and</p> <p>22 misrepresentations at the HCLOF level,</p> <p>23 that would ultimately result in the Acis</p> <p>24 bankruptcy and subsequent to that, the TRO</p> <p>25 and the inability to refinance or reset</p>	<p>Page 117</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 that has been the, far and away, the</p> <p>3 largest contributor to loss of value</p> <p>4 within the portfolio.</p> <p>5 Q. One of the allegations that</p> <p>6 HarbourVest has made is that Highland</p> <p>7 improperly changed the portfolio manager.</p> <p>8 Is it your opinion that if that had not</p> <p>9 been done, the portfolio manager had not</p> <p>10 been changed at the inception of</p> <p>11 HarbourVest's investment, that that would</p> <p>12 have preserved any value of this fund?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>14 form of the question.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>16 Calling for speculation, hypothetical</p> <p>17 lay opinion.</p> <p>18 If you have testimony, go ahead,</p> <p>19 Mike.</p> <p>20 A. Sorry, could you just repeat the</p> <p>21 question, John? I want to make sure I'm</p> <p>22 answering it correctly.</p> <p>23 Q. I guess I just want to know, and</p> <p>24 I think you kind of hinted at this a</p> <p>25 little bit earlier today, but I guess what</p>

<p>Page 118</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 I really want to know is do you think that</p> <p>3 the particular portfolio manager made a</p> <p>4 difference in the loss of value that HCLOF</p> <p>5 suffered?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>7 objections.</p> <p>8 A. Again, it sounds like you're</p> <p>9 asking a different question there than</p> <p>10 what I thought I understood your question</p> <p>11 to be initially. What I would say to that</p> <p>12 is the decision originally to change the</p> <p>13 portfolio manager, and ultimately the</p> <p>14 events that took place following the</p> <p>15 Arbitration Award for Mr. Terry, resulted</p> <p>16 in the subsequent Acis bankruptcy, which</p> <p>17 in turn has led to the destruction of</p> <p>18 value, because of the inability to</p> <p>19 refinance or reset, the underlying CLOs.</p> <p>20 Q. So HarbourVest is not alleging</p> <p>21 that the portfolio manager made any</p> <p>22 particular decisions or participated in</p> <p>23 any mismanagement that led to reduction in</p> <p>24 value?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p>Page 119</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form.</p> <p>3 A. When you're asking about</p> <p>4 portfolio manager, are we referring to the</p> <p>5 portfolio manager at the underlying CLO</p> <p>6 level or at the HCLOF level? I think</p> <p>7 there are two different levels here of</p> <p>8 portfolio management.</p> <p>9 Q. Well, I'm talking about the</p> <p>10 portfolio manager, and you can tell me</p> <p>11 which one it is, but which portfolio</p> <p>12 manager has the ability to, to impact the</p> <p>13 performance of these funds?</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Objection.</p> <p>15 A. If you're referring to HCLOF,</p> <p>16 the --</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. -- investment manager, or the</p> <p>20 portfolio manager of HCLOF has the ability</p> <p>21 to drive value creation by virtue of its</p> <p>22 equity position in the underlying CLOs.</p> <p>23 Q. Well, which portfolio manager</p> <p>24 makes the day-to-day decisions about</p> <p>25 selling assets, trading assets, that, that</p>
<p>Page 120</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 I guess --</p> <p>3 A. If you're referring to</p> <p>4 underlying credits, that would be the</p> <p>5 portfolio manager in each of the</p> <p>6 individual CLOs. The impact in value to</p> <p>7 the equity investment in the CLOs is a</p> <p>8 decision at the HCLOF level, where the</p> <p>9 majority of that value erosion has</p> <p>10 resulted from the inability to refinance</p> <p>11 or reset those CLO entities.</p> <p>12 Q. And that's what we're talking</p> <p>13 about when you said that they, that</p> <p>14 Highland changed the portfolio manager,</p> <p>15 you're talking about at the HCLOF level,</p> <p>16 right?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. Well, I was responding to the</p> <p>20 question that I thought you asked. I</p> <p>21 wasn't necessarily stating that.</p> <p>22 Q. I guess all I'm really trying to</p> <p>23 do here is just understand HarbourVest's</p> <p>24 position. And it sounds to me, and</p> <p>25 correct me if I'm wrong, it sounds to me</p>	<p>Page 121</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 that what you're saying is that the</p> <p>3 diminution of value wasn't attributable to</p> <p>4 poor investment decisions by a portfolio</p> <p>5 manager, as much as it was the</p> <p>6 consequences in the Acis bankruptcy of the</p> <p>7 change in portfolio manager; is that fair?</p> <p>8 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>9 form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>10 A. Yes, it is. That is my general</p> <p>11 understanding, yes.</p> <p>12 MR. WILSON: Okay. No further</p> <p>13 questions.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: All right. Well,</p> <p>15 thank you very much.</p> <p>16 THE REPORTER: Does anybody have</p> <p>17 any other questions?</p> <p>18 MR. KANE: Yes. This is John</p> <p>19 Kane with CLO Holdco. I'll jump on</p> <p>20 video. I've got some questions, but</p> <p>21 I'm going to be relatively short. If</p> <p>22 anybody else has a little bit heavier</p> <p>23 schedule, let me know.</p> <p>24 All right. I'll take that as a</p> <p>25 go-ahead.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 EXAMINATION</p> <p>3 BY MR. KANE:</p> <p>4 Q. This is John Kane. I represent</p> <p>5 CLO Holdco.</p> <p>6 Hi, Mike Pugatch. It's nice to</p> <p>7 talk to you.</p> <p>8 A. Likewise.</p> <p>9 Q. I just wanted to briefly</p> <p>10 confirm. I believe you testified you</p> <p>11 participated in negotiations that lead to</p> <p>12 the Settlement Agreement, that is part of</p> <p>13 the 9019 motion, before the bankruptcy</p> <p>14 court; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A. Correct.</p> <p>16 Q. And did you actively negotiate</p> <p>17 the terms of that Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. As in dollar amounts, what the</p> <p>20 consideration exchanged, how it would</p> <p>21 work, that kind of stuff, obviously with</p> <p>22 the assistance of counsel?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. All of that. The</p> <p>24 negotiations were, you know, over the</p> <p>25 course of a number of weeks and a number</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 of conversations directly with the Debtor,</p> <p>3 with counsel, all-hands calls, et cetera.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And as part of that in</p> <p>5 the Settlement Agreement, you say the</p> <p>6 HarbourVest entities were members in HCLOF</p> <p>7 are in essence selling their shares to the</p> <p>8 Debtor, and also in exchange getting some</p> <p>9 claims back in the Debtor's plan. Is that</p> <p>10 a fair summary?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>12 form. Compound question.</p> <p>13 Q. Let me ask it a different way.</p> <p>14 A. Can you re-ask that, please?</p> <p>15 Q. Yeah. I'm happy to do that.</p> <p>16 Why don't you describe for me</p> <p>17 how you would summarize that settlement?</p> <p>18 A. Largely, as I think you just</p> <p>19 described it, which was in exchange for,</p> <p>20 in exchange for the, both the unsecured</p> <p>21 creditors' claim, and subordinated</p> <p>22 creditors' claim, that settlement value is</p> <p>23 in exchange for us transferring the</p> <p>24 interest in HCLOF to the Debtor, as part</p> <p>25 of that overall negotiating package.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. And what would you estimate, I</p> <p>3 going to have to imagine, let me rephrase</p> <p>4 the question.</p> <p>5 Have you guys done kind of an</p> <p>6 internal best guess of what your unsecured</p> <p>7 and subordinated claims would be, under</p> <p>8 the plan, the value?</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>10 Objection to form.</p> <p>11 A. Just to be clear, John, are you</p> <p>12 referring to the expected recovery value</p> <p>13 of our claims?</p> <p>14 Q. Yes, sir.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>16 form. Can we just clarify, so you're</p> <p>17 talking about what they'll recover</p> <p>18 ultimately? Is that the question,</p> <p>19 John? I'm confused myself. I just</p> <p>20 want to be sure I am following.</p> <p>21 MR. KANE: Yeah. So I'm asking</p> <p>22 Mike how much he believes, based on</p> <p>23 his analysis, that HarbourVest is</p> <p>24 likely to recover from the \$45 million</p> <p>25 allowed general unsecured claim and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 \$35 million allowed subordinated</p> <p>3 claim, if the settlement is approved</p> <p>4 and the plan is confirmed.</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form.</p> <p>7 But you can answer, if you have</p> <p>8 an answer, Mike.</p> <p>9 A. We do have a sense. It's really</p> <p>10 a range of projected outcomes, as you can</p> <p>11 imagine, based on the recoveries, largely</p> <p>12 informed by conversations with the Debtor.</p> <p>13 Q. And what is that range of value?</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form.</p> <p>16 A. Our understanding, again, based</p> <p>17 on those conversations, is that the</p> <p>18 general unsecured claim could be valued in</p> <p>19 a 75 to 80 cents on the dollar recovery.</p> <p>20 And then a, you know, that the junior</p> <p>21 class claim is really sort of upside</p> <p>22 potential, to the extent there is more</p> <p>23 recovery or more asset value of the</p> <p>24 estate, for the benefit of creditors over</p> <p>25 time.</p>

<p>Page 126</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. What is your understanding of</p> <p>3 the current value of the HarbourVest</p> <p>4 shares in HCLOF that would be transferred</p> <p>5 under this Agreement?</p> <p>6 A. It's roughly \$22.5 million of</p> <p>7 their value.</p> <p>8 Q. So doing a little bit of, you</p> <p>9 know, back-of-the-table-cloth math, how do</p> <p>10 you allocate value between the releases</p> <p>11 that you are receiving and the shares that</p> <p>12 you are transferring?</p> <p>13 MR. KANE: I'm sorry. Let me</p> <p>14 rephrase that. Let me ask that</p> <p>15 question differently.</p> <p>16 Q. In addition to the claims under</p> <p>17 the plan, HarbourVest is providing the</p> <p>18 Debt -- sorry, in addition to the shares</p> <p>19 that are being transferred, HarbourVest is</p> <p>20 providing to the Debtor certain releases</p> <p>21 for its litigation claims; is that</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>24 form.</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p>	<p>Page 127</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. So how has HarbourVest allocated</p> <p>3 value, as far as this Settlement Agreement</p> <p>4 is concerned?</p> <p>5 And to make sure we're on the</p> <p>6 same page about what I'm asking,</p> <p>7 HarbourVest is trading a bundle of sticks,</p> <p>8 right? And there's really two things</p> <p>9 within that bundle of sticks, and please</p> <p>10 confirm that's correct, you're trading</p> <p>11 shares, and in addition, releases; is that</p> <p>12 right? In exchange you're getting back</p> <p>13 claims that have a potential future value.</p> <p>14 So, how have you allocated value</p> <p>15 among the shares transferred and the</p> <p>16 releases that are being granted?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection.</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>19 You can go ahead, Mike.</p> <p>20 A. Yeah. So ultimately we looked</p> <p>21 at it as a package, and so it was less</p> <p>22 about the attribution of value between the</p> <p>23 two different sticks, as you described it,</p> <p>24 and more about the overall package value</p> <p>25 in exchange for the transfer of our</p>
<p>Page 128</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 interest and the release of the claims</p> <p>3 that we had outstanding as the Debtor.</p> <p>4 MR. KANE: Now, I want to turn</p> <p>5 your attention to what I've included</p> <p>6 in the chat. You can pull it down</p> <p>7 pretty easily if you want. But it</p> <p>8 would be Holdco Depo Exhibit 2. If</p> <p>9 that would be easier than a screen</p> <p>10 share, if you'd like, I'm happy to do</p> <p>11 that as well.</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Which document</p> <p>13 is it, John? Because I just can't</p> <p>14 pull stuff off the Zoom right now.</p> <p>15 MR. KANE: Oh, I'm sorry. It's</p> <p>16 the Settlement Agreement with the</p> <p>17 attached exhibits. I can share my</p> <p>18 screen so we're all on the same page.</p> <p>19 Just to confirm we're looking at</p> <p>20 the same thing, here's the Settlement</p> <p>21 Agreement. There's a docket entry at</p> <p>22 the top so you can see it, 1631 filed</p> <p>23 by the Debtor 12/24/20.</p> <p>24 This is Exhibit 1 to the</p> <p>25 Declaration of John Morris in Support</p>	<p>Page 129</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 of Debtor's Motion for an Entry</p> <p>3 Approving Settlement with HarbourVest.</p> <p>4 BY MR. KANE:</p> <p>5 Q. Now, this Settlement Agreement</p> <p>6 is a document that you assisted in</p> <p>7 negotiations; is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And here in Section 1B,</p> <p>10 this addresses the transfer of the shares</p> <p>11 of the HarbourVest entities to a Debtor</p> <p>12 affiliate; is that correct?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>14 form.</p> <p>15 A. Correct.</p> <p>16 Q. Is that your understanding,</p> <p>17 Mr. Pugatch?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Thank you. Section 4A,</p> <p>20 and is this your understanding that</p> <p>21 HarbourVest is representing that it has</p> <p>22 the authority to enter into this agreement</p> <p>23 and to transfer the shares to the Debtor's</p> <p>24 affiliate if this is approved?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>

<p>Page 130</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form. The document speaks for itself.</p> <p>3 Is that a question, John?</p> <p>4 MR. KANE: Yeah. I asked if</p> <p>5 that was his understanding, that this</p> <p>6 is a representation by HarbourVest</p> <p>7 that it has the authority to transfer</p> <p>8 the shares if the Settlement Agreement</p> <p>9 is approved.</p> <p>10 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>11 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>12 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>13 To the extent you have a</p> <p>14 nonlegal conclusion, non-privileged</p> <p>15 understanding, Mike, you can share</p> <p>16 that.</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, I'm just saying I can only</p> <p>18 answer that based on conversations with</p> <p>19 counsel.</p> <p>20 MR. KANE: Okay. I won't push</p> <p>21 that. That's fine.</p> <p>22 Q. If we keep going down here as</p> <p>23 part of this attachment, there's a</p> <p>24 Transfer Agreement, Exhibit A to the</p> <p>25 Settlement Agreement. Are you familiar</p>	<p>Page 131</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 with this document?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. I've seen it.</p> <p>4 Q. And did you assist with the</p> <p>5 preparation or negotiation of this</p> <p>6 Agreement?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Did you understand that</p> <p>9 HarbourVest would need the consent of the</p> <p>10 HCLOF portfolio advisor to effectuate the</p> <p>11 transfer?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>13 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>14 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>15 Mike, if you have a view other</p> <p>16 than from privileged conversation, you</p> <p>17 can answer, otherwise do not answer.</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, I'm sorry. I can only</p> <p>19 answer that based on conversation with</p> <p>20 counsel and the read of the document.</p> <p>21 Q. So to make sure I understand</p> <p>22 that, you have no independent</p> <p>23 understanding of whether or not consent</p> <p>24 was required from the portfolio manager</p> <p>25 before you could effectuate a transfer; is</p>
<p>Page 132</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 that correct?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>4 I think you can give your</p> <p>5 general understanding, but then not</p> <p>6 get into specific conversations.</p> <p>7 A. My understanding of that is</p> <p>8 based on conversations with counsel, but</p> <p>9 yes, that is my understanding, John.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. I'm going to highlight a</p> <p>11 passage here. Can you see this</p> <p>12 highlighted area? "Whereas, the Portfolio</p> <p>13 Manager desires to consent to such</p> <p>14 transfers and to the admission of</p> <p>15 Transferee as a shareholder..."</p> <p>16 Were you aware of that</p> <p>17 provision?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>19 form.</p> <p>20 A. Yes. It's in the document.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you have any understanding of</p> <p>22 why that provision was included in this</p> <p>23 agreement?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>25 form. Objection to the extent it</p>	<p>Page 133</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 calls for a privileged conversation.</p> <p>3 A. As I answered before, based on</p> <p>4 conversations with counsel, my</p> <p>5 understanding is that consent is requiring</p> <p>6 in connection to transfer.</p> <p>7 Q. I'd like to turn your attention</p> <p>8 now -- this is a document you've seen</p> <p>9 before during your deposition. This is</p> <p>10 the member's agreement related to the</p> <p>11 Company for HCLOF. This is previously</p> <p>12 produced by the Debtor, that's why it's</p> <p>13 got the Bates stamp on it. This is dated</p> <p>14 November 15, 2017.</p> <p>15 Are you familiar with this</p> <p>16 document?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you see on Line 14, in the</p> <p>19 between, on Page 1 shows Highland HCF</p> <p>20 Advisor, Ltd. as the portfolio manager?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>22 Q. I know there was quite a bit</p> <p>23 of -- quite a few questions about this</p> <p>24 earlier, but you understand that Highland</p> <p>25 HCF Advisor, Ltd. is still the HCLOF</p>

<p>Page 134</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 portfolio manager?</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>4 form.</p> <p>5 A. Honestly, I don't have -- I</p> <p>6 don't have enough information to answer</p> <p>7 that definitively.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Going back to the</p> <p>9 Settlement Agreement, there's a reference</p> <p>10 in here to a defined term, "portfolio</p> <p>11 manager."</p> <p>12 Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yep.</p> <p>14 Q. And is this the same one that's</p> <p>15 listed in the Member Agreement, Highland</p> <p>16 HCF Advisor, Ltd.?</p> <p>17 A. I believe that seems to be the</p> <p>18 position, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So when we're talking</p> <p>20 about down here, "Whereas, the Portfolio</p> <p>21 Manager desires to consent," this consent</p> <p>22 provision is referring to the same</p> <p>23 definition of portfolio manager that's</p> <p>24 included in this Member Agreement; is that</p> <p>25 correct?</p>	<p>Page 135</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>3 form.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection --</p> <p>5 same objections. Objection to the</p> <p>6 extent it calls for privileged</p> <p>7 information.</p> <p>8 A. That sounds like a legal</p> <p>9 conclusion.</p> <p>10 Q. I would have thought it was</p> <p>11 reading, Mr. Pugatch.</p> <p>12 A. Well, if you're asking me to</p> <p>13 definitively confirm that, that sounds</p> <p>14 like a legal interpretation.</p> <p>15 Q. Let me ask that a different way.</p> <p>16 Do you understand that the</p> <p>17 portfolio manager is listed as Highland</p> <p>18 HCF Advisor, Ltd. in the Member Agreement?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And in this Transfer Agreement,</p> <p>21 the portfolio manager is listed as</p> <p>22 Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd.?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And those are the same entities?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p>Page 136</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. All right. Are you familiar</p> <p>3 with Section 6 of this Member Agreement?</p> <p>4 A. (Nods.)</p> <p>5 Q. Have you ever read this</p> <p>6 document?</p> <p>7 A. I have.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And can you give me your</p> <p>9 understanding of what must take place</p> <p>10 under this document for HarbourVest to</p> <p>11 transfer its shares?</p> <p>12 MS. WEISGERBER: Object to the</p> <p>13 form. Object to the extent it calls</p> <p>14 for a legal conclusion. Object to the</p> <p>15 extent it calls for any privileged</p> <p>16 information or conversations.</p> <p>17 Mike, to the extent you have an</p> <p>18 independent understanding, separate</p> <p>19 from conversations with counsel, you</p> <p>20 can answer the question.</p> <p>21 A. I would say my understanding of</p> <p>22 what's required in connection with the</p> <p>23 transfer is based on conversations with</p> <p>24 counsel.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you believe that the</p>	<p>Page 137</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 HarbourVest entities can transfer its</p> <p>3 shares without obtaining the consent of</p> <p>4 the portfolio manager?</p> <p>5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>6 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>7 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>8 Same instruction, Mike, as to</p> <p>9 privileged conversations.</p> <p>10 A. Again, my view on that would be</p> <p>11 based on conversations with counsel.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware of whether</p> <p>13 HarbourVest provided any notice to other</p> <p>14 members of its intent to transfer its</p> <p>15 shares to the Debtor's affiliate under the</p> <p>16 Settlement Agreement, other than the</p> <p>17 filing of the 9019 motion?</p> <p>18 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>19 But there is a factual question in</p> <p>20 there if you can answer it, Mike, but</p> <p>21 no privileged conversation.</p> <p>22 A. Yeah, I'm not aware of that.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you provide members 30 days</p> <p>24 after the receipt of notice of</p> <p>25 HarbourVest's intent to transfer its</p>

<p>Page 138</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 shares to the Debtor's affiliate and</p> <p>3 provide those members with an opportunity</p> <p>4 to purchase their pro rata amount of the</p> <p>5 shares?</p> <p>6 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. And just to make sure I'm not</p> <p>9 asking this question in a way that you</p> <p>10 don't understand what I'm asking: Do you</p> <p>11 see this highlighted provision here?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. I'm asking whether HarbourVest</p> <p>14 provided members 30 days after the receipt</p> <p>15 of a notice letter and an opportunity to</p> <p>16 purchase their entire pro rata share of</p> <p>17 the shares proposed to be transferred by</p> <p>18 the HarbourVest entities?</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>20 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>21 calls for privileged conversations or</p> <p>22 a legal conclusion. Objection to the</p> <p>23 extent it's asking about one piece of</p> <p>24 the document.</p> <p>25 And you're welcome to look at</p>	<p>Page 139</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 the full document if you'd like, Mike.</p> <p>3 I think it was one of the ones that</p> <p>4 was E-mailed as well, or maybe you</p> <p>5 were able to pull it down.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Yeah, no, I was.</p> <p>7 Thank you.</p> <p>8 A. And I'm sorry, John, could you</p> <p>9 just repeat the question?</p> <p>10 BY MR. KANE:</p> <p>11 Q. Yeah, sure, absolutely. And I'm</p> <p>12 not calling for any conversations with</p> <p>13 counsel. I'm asking you if you know</p> <p>14 whether HarbourVest did something or not.</p> <p>15 So let's -- let's keep it to that, because</p> <p>16 I --</p> <p>17 MR. KANE: Erica, I appreciate</p> <p>18 your concerns, but I really don't want</p> <p>19 to have any disclosures from Mike</p> <p>20 about his discussions with you on</p> <p>21 whether something needed to be done or</p> <p>22 not. I'm asking simply the facts of</p> <p>23 whether HarbourVest did it or not.</p> <p>24 Q. So did HarbourVest provide</p> <p>25 notice, 30 days' notice, to the members</p>
<p>Page 140</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 listed under this Member Agreement of</p> <p>3 HarbourVest's intent to transfer the</p> <p>4 shares that are the subject to the</p> <p>5 Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Has HarbourVest provided any</p> <p>8 members with a right of first refusal and</p> <p>9 a cash purchase price for which it would</p> <p>10 sell its shares instead of transferring</p> <p>11 those shares to the Debtor or the Debtor's</p> <p>12 affiliate under the Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>13 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>14 objections. Objection to form.</p> <p>15 Objection to extent it calls for a</p> <p>16 legal conclusion or privileged</p> <p>17 conversations, including -- regarding</p> <p>18 the specifics of that provision.</p> <p>19 I don't think that's a purely</p> <p>20 factual question.</p> <p>21 Q. Did HarbourVest offer to sell</p> <p>22 the shares to the other members? That's</p> <p>23 not a factual question?</p> <p>24 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection --</p> <p>25 A. On the basis of that factual</p>	<p>Page 141</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 question, no.</p> <p>3 Q. So let me ask this question</p> <p>4 again, I don't recall if I got an answer</p> <p>5 or not.</p> <p>6 Did HarbourVest affirmatively</p> <p>7 seek to obtain the consent of Highland HCF</p> <p>8 Advisors to transfer its shares to the</p> <p>9 Debtor affiliate under the Settlement</p> <p>10 Agreement?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>12 objections. Same instruction</p> <p>13 regarding the privileged conversation.</p> <p>14 A. I mean, as a Highland-affiliated</p> <p>15 entity, the Debtor, who's obviously the</p> <p>16 other party here involved in the transfer,</p> <p>17 you know, was involved in these</p> <p>18 discussions.</p> <p>19 Q. I'm sorry. Would you mind</p> <p>20 clarifying? Did you say that Highland HCF</p> <p>21 Advisors was involved in those discussions</p> <p>22 or the Debtor was involved in those</p> <p>23 discussions and you assume Highland HCF</p> <p>24 Advisors was?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form. Misstates testimony.</p> <p>3 A. Sorry, could you just repeat the</p> <p>4 question, please, John?</p> <p>5 Q. Yes, Mr. Pugatch.</p> <p>6 I'm actually just trying to get</p> <p>7 some clarification from you, because I</p> <p>8 don't think I understood your answer</p> <p>9 about -- I had asked just -- again, I</p> <p>10 don't want any correspondence with your</p> <p>11 counsel or what your counsel advised, I'm</p> <p>12 asking: Do you know whether HarbourVest</p> <p>13 sought written consent from Highland HCF</p> <p>14 Advisor for its -- or to transfer its</p> <p>15 shares to the Debtor or the Debtor's</p> <p>16 affiliate under the Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>18 A. My understanding is HarbourVest</p> <p>19 did not explicitly have those</p> <p>20 conversations or seek that consent.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Are you aware of whether</p> <p>22 HarbourVest received any written consent</p> <p>23 from Highland HCF Advisors, other than</p> <p>24 what's in the Transfer Agreement attached</p> <p>25 to the Settlement Agreement?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 A. I am not.</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know if HarbourVest has</p> <p>5 any written consent? Not just to seek it,</p> <p>6 but do you know if HarbourVest has a piece</p> <p>7 of paper, other than the transfer</p> <p>8 agreement, in which Highland HCF advisors</p> <p>9 provided its consent to the transfer of</p> <p>10 shares to the Debtor's affiliate?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Same</p> <p>12 objections.</p> <p>13 A. I would have to speak with</p> <p>14 counsel. I am not aware of that directly,</p> <p>15 no.</p> <p>16 Q. Are you aware of whether</p> <p>17 HarbourVest had any correspondence with</p> <p>18 HCLOF representatives about effectuating</p> <p>19 the transfer of the shares to the Debtor's</p> <p>20 affiliate under the Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>22 You can answer.</p> <p>23 A. We have had discussions with</p> <p>24 them, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Did HCLOF representatives</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 provide consent, whether written or</p> <p>3 otherwise, to the transfer?</p> <p>4 A. I am not aware that that consent</p> <p>5 has been provided as of yet.</p> <p>6 Q. Are you aware of whether any</p> <p>7 HarbourVest representatives have had</p> <p>8 conversations with the Debtor's</p> <p>9 representatives about the necessity of</p> <p>10 consent to the transfer of their shares?</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>12 form --</p> <p>13 MR. KANE: I'll re-ask the</p> <p>14 question. I want to clarify that</p> <p>15 point.</p> <p>16 BY MR. KANE:</p> <p>17 Q. Mr. Pugatch, are you aware of</p> <p>18 whether any HarbourVest representatives</p> <p>19 had conversations with the Debtor's</p> <p>20 representatives about the necessity of</p> <p>21 obtaining the HCLOF portfolio manager's</p> <p>22 written consent before transferring the</p> <p>23 shares to the Debtor's representative or</p> <p>24 affiliate under the terms of the</p> <p>25 Settlement Agreement?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>3 form.</p> <p>4 And, John, I'm sorry to do this,</p> <p>5 can you just clarify what you mean by</p> <p>6 "representative"?</p> <p>7 MR. KANE: Yeah. I mean,</p> <p>8 anybody that has agency authority to</p> <p>9 act on behalf of the Debtor in</p> <p>10 negotiations, in the preparation of</p> <p>11 the documents, in negotiation of the</p> <p>12 terms of the Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>13 I mean, I think that it's, you</p> <p>14 know, a pretty broad term here.</p> <p>15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>16 form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>17 calls for discussions with counsel.</p> <p>18 As a factual matter, if you have</p> <p>19 an answer, you can give it.</p> <p>20 A. I'm aware of conversations that</p> <p>21 have taken place about all of the terms of</p> <p>22 the Transfer Agreement in connection with</p> <p>23 the settlement, with all parties.</p> <p>24 Q. Is it your understanding based</p> <p>25 on those conversations that written</p>

<p>Page 146</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 consent of the portfolio manager as</p> <p>3 defined in the Transfer Agreement was</p> <p>4 required before the shares could be</p> <p>5 transferred under the Settlement</p> <p>6 Agreement?</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>8 the form. Objection to the extent it</p> <p>9 calls for a legal conclusion or</p> <p>10 privileged conversation. And I think</p> <p>11 that one does, John.</p> <p>12 A. Yeah, I can only answer that</p> <p>13 based on conversation with lawyers.</p> <p>14 Q. Wasn't the question whether --</p> <p>15 I'm sorry. Maybe I forgot my own</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 But I thought it was based on</p> <p>18 your conversations with the Debtor's</p> <p>19 representative, was it your understanding,</p> <p>20 not based on your conversation with</p> <p>21 counsel.</p> <p>22 MS. WEISGERBER: Can you repeat</p> <p>23 the whole question because I</p> <p>24 definitely misunderstood it then too.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Based on your</p>	<p>Page 147</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 conversations with the Debtor's</p> <p>3 representatives, was it your understanding</p> <p>4 that the consent of the portfolio manager</p> <p>5 was required for the shares to be</p> <p>6 transferred from the HarbourVest entities</p> <p>7 to the Debtor's affiliate under the terms</p> <p>8 of the Settlement Agreement?</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Okay. Same</p> <p>10 objections. Also objection to the</p> <p>11 extent there is a common interest</p> <p>12 privilege.</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall having that</p> <p>14 explicit conversation with representative</p> <p>15 of the Debtor.</p> <p>16 MR. KANE: I'll pass the</p> <p>17 witness.</p> <p>18 Thank you, Mr. Pugatch.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Anybody else?</p> <p>20 Thank you, all.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Can we --</p> <p>22 before we break, could we have a</p> <p>23 two-minute break and then come back</p> <p>24 before we conclude.</p> <p>25 BY MS. WEISGERBER:</p>
<p>Page 148</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 Q. Mr. Pugatch, during Mr. Wilson's</p> <p>3 questioning, I believe his last question</p> <p>4 related to identifying as between two</p> <p>5 choices the primary source or the cause of</p> <p>6 HarbourVest's damages.</p> <p>7 In your opinion, is -- are</p> <p>8 HarbourVest damages attributable to any</p> <p>9 one cause?</p> <p>10 A. No, I would say there were</p> <p>11 multiple root causes of the damages and</p> <p>12 diminution in value that was suffered in</p> <p>13 connection with the investment.</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Okay. I don't</p> <p>15 have any further questions.</p> <p>16 MR. WILSON: I think I'd like to</p> <p>17 ask a couple more.</p> <p>18 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>19 Q. Mr. Pugatch, I think you</p> <p>20 testified earlier that the investment in</p> <p>21 HCLOF was comprised of multiple CLOs,</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. And some of those CLOs were</p> <p>25 managed by Acis, to your understanding?</p>	<p>Page 149</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: Just to</p> <p>5 clarify, John, is this within the</p> <p>6 scope of the questions I asked</p> <p>7 Mr. Pugatch?</p> <p>8 MR. WILSON: I believe it is.</p> <p>9 I'm going to be really short. But</p> <p>10 so --</p> <p>11 MS. WEISGERBER: I would like to</p> <p>12 have a standing objection to the</p> <p>13 extent it's not within the scope of</p> <p>14 the questions that was asked to</p> <p>15 Mr. Pugatch.</p> <p>16 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>17 Q. So some of those CLOs you</p> <p>18 contend are managed by Acis?</p> <p>19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>20 form.</p> <p>21 A. A majority.</p> <p>22 Q. And just generally, do you</p> <p>23 contend that Highland managed the balance</p> <p>24 of those CLOs?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form of the question.</p> <p>3 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection.</p> <p>4 Same objection.</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Yes. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>7 And I just had two more</p> <p>8 questions.</p> <p>9 So, if there was going to be a</p> <p>10 reset, that would have to be done at the</p> <p>11 CLO level, each CLO would have to be</p> <p>12 reset?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection.</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>15 form.</p> <p>16 A. That is correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And do you know of any specific</p> <p>18 CLO that requested a reset but was not</p> <p>19 granted a reset?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to form.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>22 And foundation.</p> <p>23 A. When you say "CLOs who requested</p> <p>24 a reset," can be more clear, please?</p> <p>25 Q. We just talked about how this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 investment is comprised of multiple CLOs</p> <p>3 and each one of those CLOs would have to</p> <p>4 be reset, according to its own terms, I</p> <p>5 guess. Do you know of any one of those</p> <p>6 CLOs that requested a reset?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>8 form of the question.</p> <p>9 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>10 A. I'm aware of Highland having in</p> <p>11 its capacity as manager of the HCLOF</p> <p>12 having requested or pursued resets of</p> <p>13 certain of the Acis HCLOs.</p> <p>14 Q. Your understanding is that</p> <p>15 Highland requested a reset of the Acis</p> <p>16 CLOs?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p> <p>18 form.</p> <p>19 A. I'm sorry. I'm trying to</p> <p>20 understand what you said.</p> <p>21 MS. WEISGERBER: I'm really</p> <p>22 wondering how this relates at all to</p> <p>23 the scope of the questions I asked Mr.</p> <p>24 Pugatch on follow up.</p> <p>25 I think it's time to wrap this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 up, John.</p> <p>3 MR. WILSON: This was my last</p> <p>4 question, I just need an answer to it.</p> <p>5 And I think he tried to answer, but I</p> <p>6 didn't understand what he said.</p> <p>7 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection. Can</p> <p>8 you re-ask the question so we have a</p> <p>9 clear question.</p> <p>10 MR. WILSON: Well, Madam Court</p> <p>11 Reporter, can you read back his last</p> <p>12 response?</p> <p>13 (Record read.)</p> <p>14 BY MR. WILSON:</p> <p>15 Q. Can you repeat what you intended</p> <p>16 to answer to the last question?</p> <p>17 MS. WEISGERBER: Same objection.</p> <p>18 If you recall, Mike.</p> <p>19 A. I'm sorry, John. Can you just</p> <p>20 repeat the question, please, make sure I'm</p> <p>21 answering what you want me to answer.</p> <p>22 Q. My question is the same as it's</p> <p>23 been: Are you aware of any CLO that</p> <p>24 requested a reset and was not granted one?</p> <p>25 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 form. Objection to foundation.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the</p> <p>4 form of the question.</p> <p>5 A. Again, my understanding is the</p> <p>6 CLOs do not request the reset. Highland,</p> <p>7 as manager of HCLOF in its capacity as</p> <p>8 majority equity owner of certain of the</p> <p>9 CLOs, have requested a reset post our</p> <p>10 original investment.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. WILSON: I'll pass the</p> <p>13 witness.</p> <p>14 MS. WEISGERBER: I think we're</p> <p>15 done.</p> <p>16 THE REPORTER: Will everyone put</p> <p>17 their orders on the record, please?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: John Morris for the</p> <p>19 Debtor. Expedited, please.</p> <p>20 MR. WILSON: John Wilson. I'm</p> <p>21 not sure what arrangements my office</p> <p>22 has previously made, but we want an</p> <p>23 expedited transcript, as well.</p> <p>24 THE REPORTER: Do you want a</p> <p>25 rough too?</p>

<div style="text-align: right;">Page 154</div> <p>1 Confidential - Pugatch</p> <p>2 MR. WILSON: Yes, please.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Yes, please.</p> <p>4 MS. WEISGERBER: Same for</p> <p>5 HarbourVest, please.</p> <p>6 MR. MALONEY: I don't need an</p> <p>7 expedited transcript. I'd just be</p> <p>8 happy to get one regular copy. I'll</p> <p>9 take whatever you would produce in the</p> <p>10 ordinary course. Same as what</p> <p>11 everyone else ordered.</p> <p>12 (Time Noted: 4:35 p.m. EDT.)</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<div style="text-align: right;">Page 155</div> <p>1</p> <p>2 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 I, MICHAEL PUGATCH, do hereby</p> <p>5 acknowledge that I have read and</p> <p>6 examined the foregoing testimony, and</p> <p>7 the same is a true, correct and</p> <p>8 complete transcription of the</p> <p>9 testimony given by me, and any</p> <p>10 corrections appear on the attached</p> <p>11 Errata sheet signed by me.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 _____</p> <p>15 (DATE) (SIGNATURE)</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>																																																																																
<div style="text-align: right;">Page 156</div> <p>1</p> <p>2 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER-NOTARY</p> <p>3 PUBLIC</p> <p>4 I, Amanda Gorrone, the officer</p> <p>5 before whom the foregoing deposition</p> <p>6 was taken, do hereby certify that the</p> <p>7 foregoing transcript is a true and</p> <p>8 correct record of the testimony given;</p> <p>9 that said testimony was taken by me</p> <p>10 stenographically and thereafter</p> <p>11 reduced to typewriting under my</p> <p>12 direction; and that I am neither</p> <p>13 counsel for, related to, nor employed</p> <p>14 by any of the parties to this case and</p> <p>15 have no interest, financial or</p> <p>16 otherwise, in its outcome.</p> <p>17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have</p> <p>18 hereunto set my hand this 12th day of</p> <p>19 January, 2021.</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 AMANDA GORRONE, CLR</p> <p>23 CLR NO: 052005 - 01</p> <p>24 Notary Public in and for the State of New</p> <p>25 York</p> <p>County of Suffolk</p>	<div style="text-align: right;">Page 157</div> <p>1 ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2 Case Name:</p> <p>3 Deposition Date:</p> <p>4 Deponent:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">Pg.</th> <th style="width: 10%;">No.</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Now Reads</th> <th style="width: 35%;">Should Read</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Reason</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>6</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>12</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>21 _____</p> <p>22 Signature of Deponent</p> <p>23 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME</p> <p>24 THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 20____.</p> <p>25 (Notary Public) MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: _____</p>	Pg.	No.	Now Reads	Should Read	Reason	6	_____	_____	_____	_____	7	_____	_____	_____	_____	8	_____	_____	_____	_____	9	_____	_____	_____	_____	10	_____	_____	_____	_____	11	_____	_____	_____	_____	12	_____	_____	_____	_____	13	_____	_____	_____	_____	14	_____	_____	_____	_____	15	_____	_____	_____	_____	16	_____	_____	_____	_____	17	_____	_____	_____	_____	18	_____	_____	_____	_____	19	_____	_____	_____	_____	20	_____	_____	_____	_____
Pg.	No.	Now Reads	Should Read	Reason																																																																													
6	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
7	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
8	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
9	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
10	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
11	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
12	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
13	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
14	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
15	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
16	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
17	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
18	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
19	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													
20	_____	_____	_____	_____																																																																													

Index: \$1,570,429..additional

\$	11/29/2017 79:3	2020 16:12 59:3 109:21 112:13	49.98 27:16 65:20 66:3	accept 110:17
\$1,570,429 27:23	12/24/20 128:23	217 14:22	49.985% 85:5	accordance 59:7 103:9
\$1.02 112:19	122 61:9	23 109:20	4A 129:19	accurate 33:14 93:24
\$135 28:25 30:2	135 28:10	27 51:20 52:21	5	accusations 81:7
\$150 112:23	14 33:10 133:18	27th 51:19	5 16:16 22:15,16,17 37:13,21,22 45:11 95:11 96:24 110:14	Acis 31:22,23,24 32:4,5,12,14,24 35:2 36:11,13,24 46:10, 15,21 47:9,14,22 48:11 49:4,10,14,20 50:2,11 51:11 52:21 53:4,5 74:3 84:5 85:16 86:19,23 87:4, 13,22 88:7,11,19 89:11 90:8,17 91:2,6, 20 92:4,5,7,8,14,15, 20 93:3,18 94:12 96:5,6,7,10,11,22 97:3 101:15 104:13 105:9 107:15,23 108:3 114:6,21 115:6,20 116:23 118:16 121:6 148:25 149:18 151:13,15
\$22.5 126:6	143 14:21 16:8,11 109:9 112:21	28 21:3	50 20:11	Acis' 51:20
\$295,000 93:23 94:22 95:7 104:14	144 14:22	28th 81:17	6	Acis-branded 35:6
\$35 110:2 125:2	147 109:9	2:30 112:6	6 61:5,8 84:23 136:3	Acis-managed 35:5
\$4,998,501 27:20	149 14:23 17:3,17 109:10	3	617 22:19	Acis/hclop 11:11,12
\$44,587,820 59:3	15 27:11 33:22,24 50:13 55:17 60:11,15 64:4 69:2 112:18,23 133:14	3 18:18,19,24 26:10 28:7 58:25	63 67:14	acquiring 63:22
\$44.5 112:14	150 14:24 109:10	30 137:23 138:14 139:25	7	act 40:3 145:9
\$45 109:25 124:24	153 14:25 109:10	30(b)(6) 15:13	7 63:4,6,7 95:9 112:17	action 40:5 56:16
\$5 108:22	154 15:3 109:10	3018(a) 18:22 19:8	75 125:19	actionable 72:16
\$73 56:25	15th 50:14	31 59:3 63:8 112:13	8	actions 39:4,9,13 40:23 42:18,21 91:21 109:11 114:9
\$73,522,928 27:14	1631 109:18 128:22	35.49 65:14	8 16:12 23:14 62:3 68:3,6	actively 122:16
\$8 78:2	17 50:13	36 55:9	80 125:19	activities 53:15
(1:20 60:22	37 45:16 53:7	82 109:11	actual 113:14
(i) 42:22	1B 129:9	382 9:12	9	add 58:18
0	1st 55:22 91:7	39 54:25	9 78:21 79:2 95:24	added 111:9
08/15/2017 68:7	2	4	9019 11:2 15:8 98:3 109:17 122:13 137:17	addition 126:16,18 127:11
1	2 16:22,23 17:2,10,24 26:12 31:21 92:4 128:8	4 20:25 21:2 33:9 37:13,22 51:18 84:24 93:15	A	additional 27:20 28:3 57:16 58:8,16 95:13
1 16:4,7 19:17 31:21 59:10 61:14,15 109:23 114:22 128:24 133:19	2004 83:20 84:12,18 99:17	4.1 37:24	ability 42:16 54:7,13, 17,18,20,23 95:16 96:9,20 98:10,11 105:18 119:12,20	
10 60:11,15 83:19,20 84:3,6 97:22 99:5 103:23	2017 14:23 16:13 21:18 23:14 24:3 27:11 33:22,25 50:13,14 51:20 52:21 55:17 64:5 69:2 85:4 112:18,24 133:14	4.2 42:21	absolutely 49:24 82:19 139:11	
10/10/2018 83:22	2018 84:7 86:18 90:24 97:22 103:23 105:10,25	4.3 38:23 40:2 44:13, 22		
100 64:5,11,15	2019 59:11 90:24 91:7 107:14 114:22	4/08/2020 16:8 17:3		
1057 22:23 45:12		40,000 90:25		
11 32:2 35:9 36:12 51:19 52:22 109:4,5, 15		410 17:7		
		47 13:4		
		49 27:15 65:24		
		49.02 66:5		

Index: address..believes

address 13:3,8,9	123:5 126:5 127:3	152:21	assisted 129:6	127:12 134:8 147:23
addressed 70:8	128:16,21 129:5,22	answers 12:2	assume 141:23	152:11
addresses 129:10	130:8,24,25 131:6	apiece 112:20	attached 69:12	back-of-the-table-
adequate 56:18	132:23 133:10 134:9,	apologize 66:14	81:11 99:19 109:18	cloth 126:9
admission 132:14	15,24 135:18,20	appeared 53:12	128:17 142:24	Baker 81:16 82:7
advancing 24:4	136:3 137:16 140:2,	85:19 86:6,19	attachment 69:25	balance 149:23
advice 40:4,10 44:2	5,12 141:10 142:16,	appears 97:6	76:9 81:19,21 130:23	bankruptcy 22:24
advised 142:11	24,25 143:8,20	appointed 36:13	attendance 42:24	35:2 36:11 49:10,11
advisor 33:11,15	144:25 145:12,22	apprised 87:21	attention 70:20	52:22 53:4 58:4
35:13 36:15 131:10	146:3,6 147:8	approached 23:21	128:5 133:7	64:24 65:9 84:5
133:20,25 134:16	agreements 11:13	approval 40:8 44:23	attorneys' 113:11	85:20 86:7,20,23
135:18,22 142:14	22:5	approve 39:4 40:25	attributable 121:3	87:5,14,23 88:7,12,
advisors 58:19	agrees 95:4 110:15	approved 125:3	148:8	19 89:11 90:8,17
141:8,21,24 142:23	ahead 29:5 58:14	129:24 130:9	attribution 127:22	91:2,20 96:22 114:6
143:8	97:18 115:16 117:18	Approving 109:8	August 59:3 69:2	115:6,20 116:24
advisory 37:23,25	127:19	129:3	112:12	118:16 121:6 122:13
38:6,10,13,18,19,20	AIF 14:23 15:3	approximately	authority 40:10	Base 15:3 22:3
39:3,6,8,13,19,21	aleve 81:22	93:22 113:7	41:18 102:5,16	based 18:9 30:8
40:4,8,11,15,24	Aliza 9:4	approximation	129:22 130:7 145:8	32:15 71:17 88:4
42:22,24 43:3,11,18	all-hands 123:3	59:12	authorized 21:16	113:21 124:22
44:11,15,24 45:2	allegations 11:6	April 16:12	22:2	125:11,16 130:18
62:5,17,21 63:16	117:5	arbitration 45:22	Authorizing 109:10	131:19 132:8 133:3
67:7	alleged 11:11 56:2	46:3,8,16,21 47:17,	average 89:7	136:23 137:11
affect 54:20 74:22	85:15	20 48:8,13 51:16	avoid 54:9	145:24 146:13,17,20,
affiliate 48:23 62:6,	alleges 45:19	54:10 55:13 73:23,24	award 45:23 46:3,8,	25
15 85:2 129:12,24	alleging 118:20	76:14,20,21,25 77:7,	10,17,21,23 47:17,20	basis 28:18 29:17
137:15 138:2 140:12	alleviated 82:2	20 78:5,9,14 118:15	48:8,13 51:16 54:10	55:25 72:22 96:8
141:9 142:16 143:10,	allocate 126:10	area 132:12	55:13 76:14,20,22,25	105:20 114:18
20 144:24 147:7	allocated 127:2,14	argue 106:11	77:7,21,24,25 78:3,9,	140:25
affiliates 31:2,18	allowed 124:25	arrangements	14 118:15	Bates 133:13
32:23 62:20 79:13	125:2	153:21	awarded 46:8	bearing 73:25
85:5	alluded 79:24	article 76:10 80:14,	aware 70:14,18 75:5,	bears 109:17
affirmatively 141:6	alongside 24:19	18 81:4,7,8,23 82:5	16 76:19 80:17 94:7,	beg 20:18
affirmed 10:13	Amended 96:25	asserted 86:22	11,16,19 98:22,23	begin 34:18 108:12
afield 89:15 94:14	amount 93:22 94:22	assess 95:7	99:10 108:15,20	beginning 48:2
agency 145:8	138:4	asset 59:2,10 125:23	132:16 137:12,22	behalf 8:23 11:18
agree 9:15 11:16	amounts 122:19	assets 30:9 31:14	142:21 143:14,16	14:21 15:6,19 16:13
23:9 28:11 46:19	analysis 124:23	47:14,21 48:11,14,21	144:4,6,17 145:20	17:18 18:13 19:25
86:8 88:17 93:3	and/or 11:12 35:6	51:14 119:25	151:10 152:23	21:17,24 22:2,5
94:20 95:19 106:13	annex 16:16 17:20,	assist 131:4	back 26:9 31:20	24:15 25:11 52:13
agreed 9:23,24	21	assistance 122:22	45:10,12 53:6 57:22	98:6 102:11 108:6
agreement 9:20	answering 48:18		58:16,23 59:17 66:10	145:9
12:23 21:3,9 33:8,13	88:4 102:11 117:22		92:3 112:6 123:9	belief 49:13 54:22
37:5 44:13 63:8,11				believed 43:9 104:18
92:6 109:20,22				believes 73:12
111:2,7 122:12,17				124:22

Bellisario 79:10,16	calling 42:5 95:17 98:17 116:7 117:16 139:12	choices 148:5	107:15,23 108:3 114:2 115:7,23 116:20 118:19 119:22 120:6,7 148:21,24 149:17,24 150:23 151:2,3,6,16 153:6,9	concerns 81:22 82:3 96:3,13,20,21 139:18
benefit 46:8,17 58:19 115:8 125:24		circles 106:23		conclude 147:24
bit 117:25 121:22 126:8 133:22	calls 47:4 50:20 54:16 71:9 72:6,14 80:11 82:13,19 88:10,18 89:2 113:18 114:25 123:3 130:12 131:14 133:2 135:6 136:13,15 137:7 138:21 140:15 145:17 146:9	citation 94:8,9		conclusion 47:4 50:21,25 54:16 71:9 72:6,9,15 80:11 82:13,20 93:10 113:18 114:25 115:14 116:6 130:12, 14 131:14 135:9 136:14 137:7 138:22 140:16 146:9
board 37:23,25 38:6, 10,13,18,19,21 39:3, 6,8,13,20,22 40:4,8, 11,15 42:22,24 43:3, 11 44:11,15,24 45:2 62:6,21 67:7 73:24 79:20	capable 48:18	claim 11:7,9 14:19 15:9,10,16 16:8,11, 16 17:3,7,17,20,22 18:6 32:3 64:24 65:8 72:11,22,23 108:5, 17,23 109:9 110:2,3 123:21,22 124:25 125:3,18,21	closing 55:15,16,19 56:18	
Board's 40:24 43:19 44:11	capacity 38:20 151:11 153:7	Claimant 16:18 17:24	coaching 107:8	
Bonds 8:3	capital 26:19,22 27:21 31:22,23 32:4, 5 34:6 37:3 61:23 67:13 79:4 95:13 97:4	claims 15:23 19:22 82:5 90:2 109:23 110:16 123:9 124:7, 13 126:16,21 127:13 128:2	Coleman 8:13	conclusions 42:6 43:25
book 59:4	carbon 79:10	clarification 93:11 142:7	colleague 24:18 38:15	conditioned 40:6
borne 23:23	case 9:12 85:19,20 86:6,7 87:17	clarify 15:12 47:25 52:11 124:16 144:14 145:5 149:5	colleagues 9:2 24:18,23,25	conditions 54:19 85:18
bottom 61:14 63:20	cash 140:9	clarifying 141:20	collect 45:24	conduct 20:19
bound 9:15,22	catch 12:7 24:20	clarity 42:21	collecting 47:16 48:12	conducted 29:18 43:9 57:11
Brad 24:12 68:14 69:2 79:11,12	causing 93:21 94:21	class 125:21	collectively 66:9 67:5 85:10	conference 88:10, 18 89:2
brand 49:20	central 60:22	clear 52:19 83:11 106:9 124:11 150:24 152:9	colloquy 97:13	confidence 54:6,12
break 12:19,22 59:21,22 60:7,10,11, 13,20,22 112:3 147:22,23	cents 125:19	clarifying 141:20	color 77:15	confidential 9:18 10:1,4,9 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1
briefly 122:9	cetera 73:14 75:21 123:3	CLO 8:13,24 16:20 18:3 26:13,17 31:10, 16 38:3,10 40:21 43:6 61:17 62:11 63:17,18,23 64:5,13, 21 66:4 74:22 76:5 77:17 83:22 84:13,19 92:20,21 101:15 105:5,10 115:8 119:5 120:11 121:19 122:5 150:11,18 152:23	common 147:11	
Brigade 34:9 96:5,10 97:4	change 34:18 35:3 36:22,24 49:19 50:17 51:3,10 54:24 112:19 118:12 121:7	CLOF 110:7	communications 14:8 75:5	
bring 93:19	changed 26:2 50:15 52:6,20 74:13 117:7, 10 120:14	CLOS 30:24 32:12, 14,15 35:5,6,7 36:9, 24 41:16 53:5 54:8, 19 74:2,4 85:16 92:5, 8,14,15 93:2,19 94:12 95:14 96:7,11, 17 98:13 101:4 103:8 104:13 105:15	company 21:10,15 34:9,11 37:24 61:16 105:2 133:11	
broad 145:14	changing 49:3		comply 51:15	
broader 25:6	Chapter 32:2 35:9 36:12 52:22		component 116:2	
brought 70:20	characterized 73:19		composed 37:25	
bullet 45:20 47:11 48:9 53:8,10	charge 20:14		Composition 37:23	
bundle 127:7,9	charged 113:12		Compound 123:12	
business 74:22 76:5 77:18	chart 64:12 67:12		comprised 25:19 148:21 151:2	
<hr/> C <hr/>	chat 128:6		conceive 98:2	
call 27:21 98:12			concern 55:11 57:16	
called 10:12 34:9 105:14			concerned 86:4 127:4	

Index: confidentially..difference

113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1 153:1	contained 40:23 contend 82:6,16 149:18,23 content 76:11 context 25:7 30:19 96:16 continue 15:17 36:15 77:10 continues 31:25 contrary 40:4 contributed 27:20 contributor 117:3 control 66:21 98:10 101:5,8 102:2 105:16 controlled 47:10 62:6,15 66:19 convened 39:19 conversation 50:5,8 131:16,19 133:2 137:21 141:13 146:10,13,20 147:14 conversations 14:10 18:9 42:13 56:12 69:21 71:12,17 75:21 83:6,10 113:21 123:2 125:12,17 130:18 132:6,8 133:4 136:16,19,23 137:9, 11 138:21 139:12 140:17 142:20 144:8, 19 145:20,25 146:18 147:2 copies 79:10 copy 78:9 109:19 corporate 19:23 99:21 correct 13:10 15:10 18:12 19:14,20 22:8, 9 23:8 26:5 27:17,24 32:3 33:2,3,4 37:5, 18,19 39:22,23 40:11 41:20 43:11 46:4,11 51:23 52:2,3,7,8,24 53:17,24 55:6,7,17, 18 56:25 57:5,13,14, 19 58:11,15 62:21,25 63:23 64:6,25 65:9,	14,17 66:2,5,9 67:2, 7,10,15 68:19,23,24 74:23 75:2 76:14 80:3,4,15,16 83:13, 14 84:14 85:10,11,23 86:2 91:22 92:21 93:5 110:21,24 113:8 120:25 122:14,15 126:22,25 127:10 129:7,8,12,15,18 132:2 134:25 148:22, 23 149:3 150:16 correctly 117:22 correspondence 142:10 143:17 counsel 9:7,14,21 13:16,19,23 14:6,10 15:21 18:9 33:19 42:13 58:20 68:11 71:12,17 83:10 111:13 113:21 122:22 123:3 130:19 131:20 132:8 133:4 136:19,24 137:11 139:13 142:11 143:14 145:17 146:21 couple 23:25 24:10 148:17 court 86:24 89:19 98:3 122:14 152:10 cover 79:3 Covitz 79:9 created 38:7,8 creation 23:4 119:21 creditors 125:24 creditors' 123:21,22 credits 120:4 crisis 70:3 crusader 70:3 crystal 106:9 cumbersome 22:11 current 13:3 93:19 126:3 cut 89:21 109:19	D damaged 50:18 51:4 damages 93:21 94:22 148:6,8,11 date 17:17 29:25 33:18,20,24 55:15, 16,20 64:3 86:17 91:13 97:20 dated 84:6 133:13 Daugherty 70:3 day 78:13 100:22 day-to-day 119:24 days 137:23 138:14 days' 139:25 Debevoise 8:10 9:3 Debt 126:18 Debtor 8:8 11:6,12 59:16 108:9 110:8 123:2,8,24 125:12 126:20 128:3,23 129:11 133:12 140:11 141:9,15,22 142:15 145:9 147:15 153:19 Debtor's 16:19 18:2 22:18,25 100:20,21 109:17 110:21 111:13 123:9 129:2, 23 137:15 138:2 140:11 142:15 143:10,19 144:8,19, 23 146:18 147:2,7 Debtor's 109:7 December 109:20 decision 25:10,13 26:7 41:9 51:15 79:22 101:18 103:10 118:12 120:8 decision-making 45:3 decisionmaking 26:5 66:23 decisions 102:3,4 116:19 118:22	119:24 121:4 declaration 18:20 19:3,6,14 26:11 28:4 58:24 109:6,16 112:12 128:25 deemed 62:14 defer 15:20 define 87:16 defined 85:8 134:10 146:3 defines 61:22 definition 134:23 definitive 107:18 definitively 83:9 134:7 135:13 delay 56:17 delayed 55:15,20 delegated 102:5 depend 31:13 92:20 depending 31:9 Depo 128:8 deponent 100:6 deposition 9:15,22 10:3 11:21 12:18 13:15,22 16:4 20:20 26:15 74:10 99:11,20 100:2,12 133:9 describe 123:16 describing 56:13 designated 10:25 14:3 100:5 designates 10:5 desires 132:13 134:21 destruction 118:17 details 46:14 48:21 determination 40:6 determined 58:10 dictate 95:17 difference 30:16 49:11 118:4
--	---	--	---	---

Index: differently..fact

differently 126:15	23:4,7,11 35:22,24 36:3 37:8 40:13 44:4, 7 45:11,14 51:18 61:22 62:3,25 63:15 64:4 67:17,18,20 68:10 71:18 72:2,10 73:5 76:2,7 84:3,9 86:12,13,14,18 95:2, 10 99:14,20 109:18 128:12 129:6 130:2 131:2,20 132:20 133:8,16 136:6,10 138:24 139:2	63:5 68:2,6,12,14,25 70:2,8 73:6 76:8,11 78:21 79:3,8,25 80:6, 15 81:11,22	entire 35:14 39:19,21 138:16	exhibit 16:3,7,22,23 17:2,10 18:18,19,24 20:23,24 21:2 22:15, 16,17 26:10 31:21 33:9 37:13 45:11 58:25 61:5,8 63:3,4, 6,7 68:2,3,6 78:21 79:2,8 83:18,19,20 84:3 99:5 109:4,5,15, 19 112:17 128:8,24 130:24
diligence 28:19 29:7,10,12,18,21 53:14 56:19,21 57:12 58:8 70:14,19 77:11	documentation 77:9 111:14	E-MAILED 139:4	entities 15:6,20 18:6 21:14,17 22:6 34:4 36:22 64:23 65:5,7, 20 66:9 67:12 85:10 120:11 123:6 129:11 135:24 137:2 138:18 147:6	exhibits 128:17
diminution 51:13 121:3 148:12	documents 9:8,17 27:2,5,7,10 44:5 49:9 66:11 75:24 89:10 90:7,11,15,16,25 100:8 103:3 145:11	E-MAILING 22:15 44:5	entity 19:23 20:4,6 35:19 49:12 141:15	existence 76:19 77:24
direct 65:5	dollar 122:19 125:19	E-MAILS 75:4,14 81:3	entry 109:8 128:21 129:2	existing 63:19
direction 35:8	Dondero 8:5 81:14	earlier 65:12 66:11 75:25 79:21 91:11 92:18 112:10 117:25 133:24 148:20	Eppich 8:3	expectation 28:14
directly 18:13 90:2 123:2 143:14	Doug 74:15	easier 12:10 128:9	equity 30:23 31:16 41:15 85:7 92:15 98:12 115:8,22 119:22 120:7 153:8	expectations 103:10
director 19:18 20:3, 5,7,14 21:20,23 93:17 104:12	Douglas 8:15 74:12	easily 128:7	Erica 8:9 139:17	expected 28:8 124:12
directors 20:12 25:19,22 62:13	Dover 14:24 21:18 37:14,15,16 38:5,13 65:12	Eden 24:12 68:15 69:2 79:11,12	erosion 113:24 120:9	expedited 153:19,23
disagree 64:17 67:20	drafting 111:6,9,14	editor-in-chief 81:15	essence 123:7	expert 116:7
disclosed 78:4	Draper 8:15,16 74:12,13	effective 91:7	establish 37:24	explanation 70:15 81:9 82:4
disclosures 139:19	drive 119:21	effectuate 131:10,25	estate 125:24	explicit 147:14
discretion 41:8	DSD 74:9	effectuating 143:18	estimate 89:2 124:2	explicitly 142:19
discuss 10:25	due 28:18 29:7,9,12, 18,20 50:24 56:21 57:12 58:8 62:15 70:19 77:10 113:24 116:3	efficiently 20:22	estimated 29:25	expressed 54:6,12, 21 55:11
discussed 14:5 65:12 95:15 104:4 111:21	Dugaboy 8:16	Ellington 95:12 98:16	event 18:10 107:21	expressing 53:23
discussions 23:16, 19,24 24:5,7,16 68:17,22 69:7,9 71:19,25 111:23 139:20 141:18,21,23 143:23 145:17	duly 10:13	Ellis 8:3	events 87:22 115:5 118:14	expressly 40:6
dispute 53:11 73:21 74:20 90:23	duration 39:15	Emily 9:3	evidence 72:2 89:10 90:7	extent 42:5 44:14 47:3 50:20 54:15 71:8,10 72:5 80:10 88:2 97:14,24 113:17,19 114:24 125:22 130:11,13 131:13 132:25 135:6 136:13,15,17 137:6 138:20,23 140:15 145:16 146:8 147:11 149:13
disregard 40:10	Dustin 25:2 68:21 69:2,11 79:9,15	employee 73:22 74:21 78:6	evolved 26:2	external 58:19
distinguish 32:13, 21 92:18		employees 24:14	exact 59:11 99:9	
distinguishing 36:5		employment 73:21	Examination 10:16 83:21 84:13,19 99:18 122:2	
diversified 31:15		encourage 87:12	examined 10:14	
dividends 27:22 28:3		encouraged 87:3	exceed 28:10 30:2	
docket 22:23 45:11 128:21		engaged 23:15,19 24:7	exchange 123:8,19, 20,23 127:12,25	
document 9:11 16:10,17,23 19:10		engaging 24:16	exchanged 122:20	
		ensure 12:12,15 45:23 56:18,21	exclusive 41:18	
		entail 44:17	executed 109:20	
		enter 41:9,19 129:22		
		entered 9:11 11:14 27:7,10 103:4		
	E			F
	E-MAIL 16:5,22 18:25 20:25 61:5			fact 19:13 88:9

facts 13:18 54:4 55:10,24 56:4 58:5,6 139:22 factual 11:6 137:19 140:20,23,25 145:18 fair 32:24 59:6 121:7 123:10 familiar 34:8 69:3 130:25 133:15 136:2 feature 111:22 February 59:10 91:7 114:22 feel 12:18 feelings 102:8 fees 113:11 figure 72:25 figures 28:16 filed 14:19 16:8,11,13 17:3,17,18 18:5 22:23 23:7 32:2 36:12 49:9 58:3 64:23 65:8 66:11 84:4 89:10 90:8 97:21 100:3 112:12 128:22 filing 137:17 final 25:10 financial 70:2 fine 10:7 59:23 60:17, 20 130:21 finished 12:13,15 firm 8:3 25:20 follow 151:24 follow-up 69:14,15, 20 force 105:19 forgot 146:15 form 17:7 28:18 29:4, 15 30:4 31:7 32:9,18 33:18 34:14,21 35:17 36:3,18 37:7 39:11 40:13 41:12,22 42:4 43:13,22 44:19 45:6 46:6,13,25 47:3,24	28:17 49:17 50:20 52:10 53:2,19 54:2, 15 56:8,10 57:8,21 58:13 61:20 62:23 64:2,8,20 65:3,16,23 66:7 67:4,9,17,22 69:19 70:11,24 71:8 72:5 74:25 75:9 76:16 77:4,13,23 78:11,17 80:10 81:6, 25 82:11 85:25 86:10 87:2,7,11,25 88:14 89:5,13 90:10,19 91:4,16,24 92:11,13, 22,24 93:7,8 94:2,4, 25 95:22 96:15 97:24 98:21 99:7,14 100:15,24 101:11,24 103:15 104:19 105:12 106:3 107:17, 25 108:19 109:2 110:12,23 111:4,11, 19 113:2,17 114:14, 24 115:13 116:6 117:14 119:2,18 120:18 121:9 123:12 124:10,16 125:6,15 126:24 129:14 130:2, 11 131:13 132:19,25 134:4 135:3 136:13 137:6 138:20 140:14 142:2 144:12 145:3, 16 146:8 149:20 150:2,15,20 151:8,18 153:2,4 forma 56:15 formally 38:20 formed 29:17 forming 55:25 found 12:9 foundation 41:12 46:6 48:17 53:2 64:8 70:11 91:4,24 93:9 94:2,4,25 96:15 104:20 107:25 108:19 113:2 115:13 116:6 150:22 153:2 four-man 26:6 four-member 25:18 79:20 frequently 89:8	front 44:7 full 10:22 44:7 52:4 55:23 62:4 105:16 139:2 fully 66:18 function 43:19 fund 14:22 16:14 63:18 111:7 117:12 Funding 8:24 16:20 18:3 61:17 63:17 83:22 84:14,20 funds 17:25 19:25 26:13,17 85:7 119:13 future 127:13 <hr/> G <hr/> general 43:19 73:9, 17 75:12 101:2 109:25 110:10 121:10 124:25 125:18 132:5 generally 73:10 149:22 Gerard 81:16 82:7 gist 74:18 110:19 give 72:19 102:25 106:5 115:2 132:4 136:8 145:19 giving 12:2 106:19 107:8 Global 14:22,23 16:14 21:19 go-ahead 121:25 go-forward 105:19 good 8:17 13:2 60:18 Goren 9:4 governance 66:21 GP 31:23 32:5 granted 127:16 150:19 152:24 ground 12:24 grounds 13:21	Group 37:17 guess 16:24 59:5 62:3 70:4 86:3 114:17 117:23,25 120:2,22 124:6 151:5 guided 103:7 guidelines 103:2,6 105:14 guys 61:2 124:5 <hr/> H <hr/> half 63:21 happen 59:9 happenings 105:5 happy 12:8 123:15 128:10 Harbour 87:20 Harbourvest 8:11 9:4 10:5,25 11:3,13, 14,18 14:18,21,22, 23,24,25 15:3,15 16:13 17:18 18:5,10, 21 19:4,7,18,21 20:2, 12,15 21:14,18,21,24 22:2,5,6,18,25 23:15, 18,22 24:8,15 25:3,4, 8,11,15 26:12 27:13, 19 28:2,8 30:21 31:4 37:14,17 41:24 42:16 43:7 45:18,21 47:13 49:2,13,21 51:4 52:4, 12,16 53:11,13,24 54:4 55:4,5,11,23 56:24 57:3,9,11,15 58:5 63:22 64:23 65:4,19 66:8,12,20, 24 67:6,12 68:22 69:7 70:6 71:24 73:11 75:7,18 76:13 78:8 79:18 80:3,8 82:8 85:9 86:19 87:4, 13,21 88:3 89:16 90:3,6,17 91:2 92:9 95:16 97:10 98:8 105:18 108:6,17,22 109:9,24 110:5,15, 16,17,20 111:16 117:6 118:20 123:6 124:23 126:3,17,19 127:2,7 129:3,11,21	130:6 131:9 136:10 137:2,13 138:13,18 139:14,23,24 140:7, 21 141:6 142:12,18, 22 143:4,6,17 144:7, 18 147:6 148:8 Harbourvest's 11:7, 8 36:19 49:22 50:9, 16 52:2 71:20 72:21, 23 83:12 97:19,25 101:8 117:11 120:23 137:25 140:3 148:6 Harbourvest- prepared 86:14 95:2 Hayley 8:7 HCF 33:11,15 35:13 36:15 51:22 133:19, 25 134:16 135:18,22 141:7,20,23 142:13, 23 143:8 HCLF 63:16 HCLO 101:19 HCLOF 18:7,11 20:16 22:7 24:2 26:14,16,25 27:15,17 28:9 30:10,22,23 31:5,15,25 32:7,12, 20 33:2,4 34:5,7 35:19 36:6,10,14,21, 25 41:15 42:19 49:4 50:12 51:14,21 52:6, 20 54:7,9,13 55:4,14 59:2,8,10 64:6 65:6 66:18,23 76:18 77:16 85:14 91:13,22 92:14 93:5,17,22 96:17 98:9,18 102:2 103:3, 6 104:12 105:6 112:13 113:12 115:9, 19 116:22 118:4 119:6,15,20 120:8,15 123:6,24 126:4 131:10 133:11,25 143:18,25 144:21 148:21 151:11 153:7 HCLOF's 54:18,22 HCLOF/ALF 84:25 HCLOS 151:13 hear 43:15 60:3
--	--	--	---	--

TSG Reporting - Worldwide 877-702-9580

Index: kind..misrepresentations

126:13 128:4,15 129:4 130:4,20 139:10,17 144:13,16 145:7 147:16 kind 114:18 117:24 122:21 124:5 King 8:23 knowledge 52:5 55:24 70:9 88:5 107:22 108:24 <hr/> L <hr/> L.P. 14:22,24,25 15:3 16:14 17:19 18:5,11 20:2 26:20,23 31:24 32:6 37:15 47:15,22 48:12 61:24 67:13 Labovitz 9:3 laid 103:5 large 85:6,13 largely 17:21 114:3 123:18 125:11 larger 24:13 66:3 largest 37:16 64:10 65:11,13 66:4,24 117:3 late 105:10 Latham 8:20 lawsuit 76:4 lawyers 75:21 83:6 146:13 lay 115:2 117:17 layman's 47:6 lays 55:25 lead 111:13 122:11 leading 115:5 led 51:12 113:15 118:17,23 legal 15:21 42:6 43:24,25 47:4 50:21, 25 54:16 56:22 69:12,22 71:9 72:6,9, 15 80:11 82:13,20 93:9 113:18 114:25	115:13 116:6 130:12 131:14 135:8,14 136:14 137:7 138:22 140:16 146:9 letter 79:3 81:13 82:7,17,25 83:9,11 138:15 level 34:5 36:6,25 116:22 119:6 120:8, 15 150:11 levels 119:7 lieu 42:25 light 49:15 likewise 12:14 122:8 limitation 11:10 limited 8:14,24 16:18 17:25 40:14 list 39:14 listed 33:11 35:21 37:2,4 44:21 134:15 135:17,21 140:2 listening 107:10 lists 39:5 litigation 51:11 53:12 70:13 73:13, 19,25 77:6 78:7 114:4 126:21 LLC 19:19,22 20:12 21:21,24 31:23 32:5 LLP 8:20 37:4 located 13:6 Logan 8:13 long 45:14 looked 17:22 127:20 losing 104:14 114:11 loss 113:13 116:2 117:3 118:4 losses 85:15 lot 20:20 113:23 LP 8:4 15:4 92:4 lumped 15:9	<hr/> M <hr/> machines 74:13 Madam 152:10 made 10:10 11:12 22:6 25:10,14 26:7 35:13 45:19 52:23 57:3,9 71:6,22 72:11 73:12 79:21 80:7 82:5 90:3 92:9 117:6 118:3,21 153:22 maintain 9:19 majority 120:9 149:21 153:8 make 25:11 41:9 85:17 99:15 117:21 127:5 131:21 138:8 152:20 makes 119:24 making 28:3,21 76:17 77:11 102:3 Maloney 8:22 41:4, 13,23 91:25 92:10,22 93:8 94:3 104:19 113:3 114:12 managed 16:19 18:2 19:25 26:19,22 74:3 148:25 149:18,23 management 26:19, 23 31:22,23 32:5,6 36:23 37:4 51:21 53:5 61:23 66:23 67:13 79:4 92:6 97:5 98:11 116:19 119:8 manager 26:25 27:4 30:12,13,14,17,18, 20,23 31:4,12,24 32:7,11,21 33:12,16, 25 34:6 35:4,14,25 36:6,7,14,16,21,25 40:3,9 41:15 42:19 45:4 49:4,19 50:12, 14,18 51:3,10 52:5, 20,24 54:24 63:17 66:20 85:6 92:19 93:2 96:7 101:19 102:2,6 117:7,9 118:3,13,21 119:4,5, 10,12,19,20,23	120:5,14 121:5,7 131:24 132:13 133:20 134:2,11,21, 23 135:17,21 137:4 146:2 147:4 151:11 153:7 manager's 144:21 managers 30:25 31:9,17 34:18 35:21 manages 17:24 38:16 92:5 managing 19:18,24 20:3,5,7,11,13 21:20, 23 25:19,21 32:15,25 93:4 104:24 105:3 Mark 8:22 94:3 marked 10:4,9 16:9 17:4 18:22 21:3 22:20 26:10 58:24 61:9 63:9 68:7 79:5 83:23 109:11 market 54:19 59:6 85:18 93:20 Massachusetts 13:5 material 51:12 55:10 58:5 71:5,23 72:3 82:9,18 math 65:25 113:6 126:9 matter 9:7 14:20 44:16,20 70:3 145:18 matters 11:2,17 14:4,5 70:6,7,13 Mclaughlin 8:19,20 meaning 52:16 66:17 meant 53:20 medium 99:9 meet 39:8 meeting 39:18 43:2, 8 member 19:24 21:2 25:3 37:3,4,5 62:5 79:17,23 134:15,24 135:18 136:3 140:2	member's 133:10 members 21:9 24:10 25:24,25 33:7,12 42:23 43:2,5 123:6 137:14,23 138:3,14 139:25 140:8,22 memorandum 33:21 40:7 61:9,13 85:3 memory 89:6 mentioned 68:15 met 38:19 Michael 10:23 18:20 19:6 79:9 middle 55:10 Mike 29:5 42:7,13 43:23 44:3 47:5 48:19 50:22 51:8 52:17 58:14 59:25 60:5,6,18 71:10 73:9 75:19 82:12 83:4 86:11 98:5 99:15 102:23 113:5,19 115:3,16 116:9 117:19 122:6 124:22 125:8 127:19 130:15 131:15 136:17 137:8, 20 139:2,19 152:18 Mike's 97:15 million 28:10,25 30:2 56:25 78:2 108:22 109:25 110:2 112:14, 21,23 124:24 125:2 126:6 millions 85:15 mind 141:19 minor 74:20 minority 26:13 66:17 98:9 101:5 minute 59:18 minutes 60:11,16 mismanagement 116:4,15,21 118:23 misrepresentation 72:24 73:4 82:9 misrepresentations
--	---	---	---	---

45:18 55:3 56:2 57:23 71:6,23 72:3, 10,14,16,17 73:2,11 75:6,17 76:3 80:7 82:17,19,22 116:22 misrepresented 82:24 misstates 29:4 40:13 47:24 56:10 57:21 58:13 92:24 105:12 121:9 142:2 misunderstood 146:24 month 89:7 morning 68:10 84:4 Morris 8:6 46:24 56:7 74:7,14 106:2,7 109:6,16 117:13 119:14 121:14 127:17 128:25 135:2 147:19 149:25 150:13,20 151:7 153:3,18 motion 11:2 15:8 18:21 19:7 84:12,18 87:18 89:18 98:3 99:4,12,16,17,19 100:2 104:5 109:7,17 122:13 129:2 137:17 mouse 38:23 mouth 74:18 move 15:25 103:17 muddled 48:3 multiple 31:16 148:11,21 151:2 <hr/> N <hr/> named 26:24 names 34:4 Natasha 9:3 nature 57:4 necessarily 120:21 necessity 144:9,20 needed 22:11 139:21	Needham 13:4 negotiate 122:16 negotiated 108:4,8 negotiating 123:25 negotiation 131:5 145:11 negotiations 11:5 13:19 108:11 111:23 122:11,24 129:7 145:10 net 59:2,9 nice 122:6 Nick 79:10,16 Nods 21:11 71:2 90:22 136:4 nominee 110:8 non-discretionary 62:16 non-privileged 51:7 72:18 115:15 130:14 Nonetheless 98:5 nonlegal 113:20 130:14 nonresponsive 57:25 105:22 Nos 109:9 Notary 10:13 notice 137:13,24 138:15 139:25 notwithstanding 54:8,23 November 27:10 33:22,24 50:13 55:17,22 64:4 81:16 85:4 108:13 112:18, 23 133:14 number 9:12 16:11 18:18 29:10,12,16 39:5 59:11 95:8 112:20 113:25 122:25 numbered 14:21 numerous 104:23	<hr/> O <hr/> oath 11:24 object 13:21 15:12 42:4,17 57:25 94:4 97:13,14 105:19 136:12,13,14 objected 41:24 97:10 objection 11:9 22:19 23:2 29:3,14 30:3 31:6 32:8,17 33:17 34:13,20 35:10,16 36:2,17 37:6 39:10, 11 40:12 41:3,11,21 43:12,21 44:18 45:5 46:5,12,24 47:2,3,23 48:5,6,16 49:16 50:19,20 51:5 52:9, 14,25 53:18,25 54:14,15 56:7,9 57:7, 20 58:12 61:19 62:22 63:25 64:7,19 65:2, 15,22 66:6 67:3,8,16, 21 69:18 70:10,23 71:7,8 72:4,5 74:24 75:8 76:15 77:3,12, 22 78:10,16 80:9,10 81:5,24 82:10 83:15 85:24 86:9,25 87:6, 10,24 88:2,13,21 89:4,12 90:9,18 91:3, 15,23 92:10,12,22,23 93:7,8,25 94:13,24 95:21 96:14 97:23,24 98:20 99:6,13 100:14,23 101:10,23 102:10,21 103:14 104:3,7,19 105:11,21 106:2 107:16,24 108:18,25 110:11,22 111:3,10,18 112:25 113:16,17 114:12,13, 23,24 116:5,17 117:13,15 118:25 119:14,17 120:17 121:8 123:11 124:9, 10,15 125:5,14 126:23 127:17,18 129:13,25 130:10,11 131:12,13 132:3,18, 24,25 134:3 135:2,4, 5 137:5,6,18 138:6,	19,20,22 140:14,15, 24 141:25 142:17 143:3,21 144:11 145:2,15,16 146:7,8 147:10 149:2,12,19, 25 150:3,4,13,14,20, 21 151:7,9,17 152:7, 17,25 153:2,3 objections 72:13 73:8 83:3 104:8,22 106:18 115:13 118:7 135:5 140:14 141:12 143:12 147:10 obligation 46:23 obtain 141:7 obtaining 137:3 144:21 occur 50:8 occurred 87:22 89:2 94:17 114:20 October 51:19,20 52:21 84:6 86:18 97:22 103:23 105:25 107:14 offer 140:21 offered 108:21 offering 40:7 61:8,13 85:3 office 153:21 official 17:6,7 omissions 55:4 Omnibus 22:19 23:2 one's 17:18 ongoing 66:22 73:19,25 77:6,17 114:4 operations 29:13 opinion 53:16,19,24 54:11 71:4 80:5 101:20,21 102:20 103:19 105:9,24 106:15,16,24 107:14, 19,21 113:20 114:10 115:2 116:2,7 117:8, 17 148:7 opportunities 23:25	opportunity 23:6,23 24:2 25:9 29:8,19 103:7 138:3,15 opposed 39:18 order 9:10,11,16,23 10:10 79:7 99:23 109:8 orders 153:17 Ordinary 63:12 organization 27:2,4 original 28:9,12 29:7 30:8 96:18 101:2 105:13 114:3 153:10 originally 24:9 28:17 29:16 115:18 118:12 originated 29:11,12 outcome 76:20 77:6, 7,15 outcomes 125:10 outstanding 70:12 128:3 owned 36:10 67:6 85:5 92:14 owner 153:8 ownership 85:14 owns 41:15 <hr/> P <hr/> Pachulski 8:7 package 123:25 127:21,24 pages 16:8 17:3 21:3 22:19 61:9 63:9 90:25 109:11 paper 143:7 papers 113:10 paragraph 17:23 19:17 23:14 26:12 28:7 31:21 37:21,22, 24 38:23 39:2 40:2 45:16 51:19 53:7 54:25 55:9 58:25 62:4 64:13 84:23 92:4 93:15 95:9,23
---	--	--	---	--

96:24 109:23 110:5, 14,19 Parker 79:11,12 part 24:21 26:6 28:20 29:6,9 36:14 45:2 54:9 56:17 75:24 76:3 77:8 86:4 96:18 110:4 111:6 113:13 114:2 122:12 123:4, 24 130:23 partially 36:10 participants 9:14,21 participate 23:3 87:4,13,15 participated 88:18 118:22 122:11 parties 145:23 partner 16:18 partners 14:23 17:19,25 18:5,11 19:18,21 20:2,12 21:21,24 party 11:15 98:17 110:15,17 141:16 pass 147:16 153:12 passage 132:11 passive 26:12 66:13, 15 98:8 101:5 past 57:13 path 89:25 patience 20:19 pay 46:23 paying 45:22 48:8 pending 54:10 penultimately 28:20 people 12:11 percent 27:15,17 64:5,11,15 65:14,20, 24 66:3,5 67:14 percentage 64:15 65:14,25 66:25 85:14 Perfect 60:24	performance 119:13 performed 58:8 97:3 performing 29:20 period 40:20 114:7 person 11:17 21:16 22:2 personal 101:21 102:8 103:19 105:23 perspective 15:21 81:10 piece 107:5 138:23 143:6 place 35:3,23 91:20 118:14 136:9 145:21 placing 64:14 plan 91:6 96:5 97:2 110:17,21 111:17 114:21 123:9 124:8 125:4 126:17 play 40:16 44:15 pleading 58:3 Plimpton 8:10 point 24:11 35:24 45:20 47:12 48:10 53:10 89:21 90:13 94:18 98:25 106:21 107:3 144:15 pointed 38:23 points 53:8 policy 59:7 poor 121:4 portfolio 30:12,14, 17,25 31:3,9,12,15, 17,24 32:6,11,21 33:12,15,25 34:18 35:4,14,21,25 36:5,6, 13,16,23,24 40:3,9 45:3 49:3,19 50:12, 14,18 51:3,10,20 52:5,20,23 54:24 63:17 92:6,16,19,25 96:7 98:11 101:25 104:25 116:4,14 117:4,7,9 118:3,13, 21 119:4,5,8,10,11, 20,23 120:5,14	121:4,7 131:10,24 132:12 133:20 134:2, 10,20,23 135:17,21 137:4 144:21 146:2 147:4 portion 32:25 92:16 93:5 116:15 position 31:10 41:16 49:12 50:17 71:22 80:6 85:20 86:7 97:8, 19,25 100:12,20,21 108:16 119:22 120:24 134:18 positions 23:10 30:24 31:17 86:23 105:6 possibly 104:9 post 153:9 post-petition 96:8 potential 125:22 127:13 practical 44:16,20 pre-investment 68:17 predicated 101:3 preexisting 62:16 prefer 60:15 preference 101:9 preliminary 9:6 23:15,19 preparation 13:25 131:5 145:10 prepared 13:22 14:11,15 presented 53:13 54:4 presently 96:3 preserved 117:12 pretty 89:15 128:7 145:14 prevailing 85:17 prevent 47:16 48:12 prevented 91:21	preventing 115:18 previous 17:22 72:7 previously 50:11 57:4 133:11 153:22 price 140:9 primarily 24:17,19, 23 primary 148:5 prior 50:9,12 51:25 52:6 64:3,14 71:20 76:17 114:20 private 85:6 privilege 13:21 147:12 privileged 131:16 133:2 135:6 136:15 137:9,21 138:21 140:16 141:13 146:10 pro 56:15 138:4,16 problem 74:14 problems 12:4 proceeding 88:8 proceeds 28:8 process 56:21 produce 11:4 produced 9:8,17 75:13 100:8 133:12 production 75:11,25 progressed 24:13 prohibited 114:8 projected 28:9,12 30:8 125:10 projection 29:22 prominent 111:22 pronounce 10:19 proof 11:7 16:7,16 17:2,6,7,16,20,22 18:6 32:3 65:8 proofs 14:19 15:8,15 64:24	proper 36:8 proposed 41:8 99:22 110:21 138:17 protective 9:11,23 10:10 provide 51:6 71:13 73:14 77:10 89:9 90:6,16 137:23 138:3 139:24 144:2 provided 28:17 70:5 71:18 73:5 77:19 82:3,8 90:12,15,24 137:13 138:14 140:7 143:9 144:5 providing 126:17,20 provision 132:17,22 134:22 138:11 140:18 proximate 105:4 107:20 Public 10:13 Pugatch 10:1,18,20, 21,23 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1,20 19:1,6 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1,18 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1, 10 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1,4 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1,13 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1,10 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1
--	--	---	---	--

Index: pull..respective

117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1,6 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1,17 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1,11 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1,5 143:1 144:1,17 145:1 146:1 147:1,18 148:1,2,19 149:1,7,15 150:1 151:1,24 152:1 153:1 pull 16:23 44:8 61:6 68:4 78:22 83:25 109:14 128:6,14 139:5 purchase 138:4,16 140:9 purchased 112:19 purchasing 67:14 purely 140:19 purpose 15:7 purposes 62:24 pursuant 18:22 19:8 pursue 96:10 105:17 pursued 97:9 151:12 pursuing 96:3,13 115:19 purview 98:14 push 130:20 put 19:2 45:12 63:6 74:17 91:19 111:5 153:16 putting 95:13 puzzle 107:6 <hr/> Q <hr/> quantum 77:25 question 12:3,7,13, 16,21,22 15:18 46:25 47:7,25 48:19 56:8 66:15 71:16 84:15 86:17 90:4 92:11 97:17 100:18 102:15,	22 104:10 106:3,12, 20 114:15 116:11 117:14,21 118:9,10 120:20 123:12 124:4, 18 126:15 130:3 136:20 137:19 138:9 139:9 140:20,23 141:2,3 142:4 144:14 146:14,16,23 148:3 150:2 151:8 152:4,8, 9,16,20,22 153:4 questioning 148:3 questions 11:25 12:25 56:20 69:14,16 88:3 121:13,17,20 133:23 148:15 149:6, 14 150:8 151:23 quick 59:21 60:7 112:7 quickly 15:12 <hr/> R <hr/> range 125:10,13 rata 138:4,16 rates 93:20 re-ask 123:14 144:13 152:8 reaction 81:3 read 40:16 49:8 76:21 78:14 81:18 99:3 110:18 113:10 131:20 136:5 152:11, 13 reading 58:2 77:2 135:11 reads 62:25 ready 12:25 112:4 reason 49:3 56:17 64:16 67:19 reasonable 29:22 recall 25:23 28:16 30:5 34:3 35:18 38:14,17 43:8 50:5 64:9,11 69:17,23 80:21,22 88:15 90:11,14,20,21 91:5,	14,18 99:9,25 100:16,17 101:12,13, 14 107:4,18 111:20 141:4 147:13 152:18 receipt 137:24 138:14 receive 56:5,12 109:24 received 27:22 28:2 57:15 58:9,17 68:10 84:4 142:22 receiving 81:3 126:11 recently 93:16 94:10 recess 61:3 112:8 recognize 68:11 recollection 43:14, 17 recommendations 102:4 record 10:22 152:13 153:17 recover 124:17,24 recoveries 125:11 recovery 124:12 125:19,23 redeem 54:7,18 115:23 reduction 114:20 116:16 118:23 refer 45:10 reference 134:9 referenced 69:25 referencing 92:25 referring 26:16 30:14 101:15 103:22 119:4,15 120:3 124:12 134:22 refers 66:12 refinance 98:12 103:8 105:15 113:25 115:7 116:25 118:19 120:10 refinances 115:23 refinancing 40:19 96:17 101:3 refusal 140:8 refute 82:4 regularity 88:25 related 11:2,15 36:22 66:22 90:25 133:10 148:4 relates 36:8 51:13 90:2 92:8 151:22 relating 21:10 relations 24:11 relationship 62:17 release 128:2 releases 126:10,20 127:11,16 relevant 47:20 98:2 reliance 55:2 remained 115:21 remedies 42:2 remember 112:15 Reorganized 96:4, 10 97:3 repeat 12:8 90:3 114:15 117:20 139:9 142:3 146:22 152:15, 20 repeats 63:15 rephrase 124:3 126:14 reporter 93:11 121:16 152:11 153:16,24 represent 8:4 68:9 122:4 representation 130:6 representations 11:11 representative 15:19 38:3,4,9,12 99:21 144:23 145:6	146:19 147:14 representatives 68:16 88:11 143:18, 25 144:7,9,18,20 147:3 represented 43:5,6 49:2 74:20 78:4 representing 96:24 129:21 request 10:8 78:8 153:6 requested 9:9,13 55:12 56:3 77:9,14 150:18,23 151:6,12, 15 152:24 153:9 requesting 12:22 requests 99:20 require 44:23 required 39:3,7 40:25 81:9 102:19 131:24 136:22 146:4 147:5 requiring 133:5 reread 83:8 reset 40:18,20,22 41:7,9,19,25 42:17 54:7,18 85:16 93:18, 21 94:12,21 95:14,18 96:4,11,13,16 97:2,8, 10,20 98:11,18 100:13,22 101:3,17, 21 102:9,17 103:8, 13,20,22,23,24 104:2,4,5,13,16 105:10,15,24 107:15, 23 108:3 113:25 115:7,11,24 116:25 118:19 120:11 150:10,12,18,19,24 151:4,6,15 152:24 153:6,9 resets 151:12 resolutions 39:17 respect 40:5,14 50:24 71:4 77:20 91:21 98:18 114:9 respective 62:13
--	---	--	--

Index: responding..subsequently

responding 120:19	151:23	129:3,5 130:8,25	siphon 47:14 48:11	started 108:13
response 11:9 22:18,25 48:6 76:9 152:12	Scott 93:17 94:6 104:11,17	134:9 137:16 140:5, 12 141:9 142:16,25 143:20 144:25 145:12,23 146:5 147:8	siphoned 47:21 48:15,22	starting 89:14
responsibility 93:4	screen 16:6,24 17:8, 11,14 18:16 19:3 21:7 22:14,23 37:11 44:14,22 45:13,17 61:6 63:6 67:25 68:4 78:23 84:2 93:16 109:15 112:5,17 128:9,18	Shannon 8:19	sir 124:14	starts 86:5
responsible 47:19	scroll 16:15 17:19 21:12,22 45:13 84:22	share 16:6,24 18:16 21:6 22:14,22 37:11 45:12 61:7 63:7 64:15 65:14 67:25 68:5 78:24 84:2 109:15 112:5,17 128:10,17 130:15 138:16	Skew 15:3 22:3	state 10:14,21 33:18
restate 87:25	scrolled 81:12	shared 17:9	skip 28:6	stated 24:3 26:14 71:21 87:18 107:19
result 74:2 85:4,16 96:22 99:12 100:9 114:4 115:5 116:23	SEC 70:2	shareholder 63:19 66:4 132:15	solo 20:20	statement 93:24 94:16
resulted 118:15 120:10	secondary 15:2 25:8	shares 63:12,22 64:6 66:25 112:19,21 123:7 126:4,11,18 127:11,15 129:10,23 130:8 136:11 137:3, 15 138:2,5,17 140:4, 10,11,22 141:8 142:15 143:10,19 144:10,23 146:4 147:5	sophisticated 55:6	statements 23:10
review 23:7 78:9	Section 44:12 129:9, 19 136:3	shed 49:15	sort 125:21	states 32:4 45:20 110:5
reviewed 57:17 75:24	seek 141:7 142:20 143:5	short 121:21 149:9	sought 58:5 142:13	stating 120:21
reviewing 58:20	Seery 108:10,15,21 111:15	shortened 82:22	sound 56:23	stemming 51:14
rights 42:2,17 51:21 66:21 110:6	sell 140:10,21	shortly 80:14	sounds 13:2 27:18 51:24 118:8 120:24, 25 135:8,13	steps 45:23
Road 13:4	selling 119:25 123:7	shots 95:17 98:18	source 148:5	sticks 127:7,9,23
role 40:14 44:15	send 16:21 83:18 109:3	show 69:24	Spalding 8:23	stop 18:15 22:14 37:10 67:25 112:5
room 13:11	sending 16:4 20:25	showing 17:11,14,15	speak 143:13	Street 14:24 21:18 37:15 65:12 76:10 80:13,18 81:15
root 148:11	sense 99:15 125:9	shows 133:19	speaks 36:3 67:17 130:2	Strike 88:23
rough 153:25	sentence 31:22 48:24 84:24 85:13 86:5	side 68:22	specific 34:3 48:20 75:4 90:15 101:16 102:22 103:5 116:10 132:6 150:17	structural 58:20
roughly 27:14 112:23 126:6	sentences 40:2	sign 21:17	specifically 11:3 25:7 27:16 78:12 95:7 100:17	structure 56:15,22
routine 45:2	separate 15:22 18:5 42:12 75:20 83:5 136:18	signature 21:13	specifics 13:24 35:18 101:14 107:4 140:18	stuff 20:21 122:21 128:14
Rule 18:22 19:8	separately 80:20	signed 15:15 22:4 43:2 103:4	speculate 116:18	sub-advisor 35:7 36:7
rules 12:24	serve 36:15 96:6	significant 114:19	speculation 106:22, 25 116:8 117:16	sub-manager 34:12
ruling 78:6 115:20	settle 108:22	similar 42:18 115:21	spelled 44:12	subject 9:9 54:19 140:4
Russell 8:13	settlement 11:5 13:19 15:7 78:5 89:18 108:5 109:8, 20,22,23 110:10 111:2 122:12,17 123:5,17,22 125:3 127:3 128:16,20	simply 48:25 139:22	spots 67:7	submit 16:2 20:24
<hr/> S <hr/>		single 15:22 37:17	stamp 133:13	submitted 18:25
sat 34:4			stamped 9:18	subordinated 110:2 123:21 124:7 125:2
satisfied 29:21 57:18			standing 52:14 149:12	Subscription 63:8, 11
Schafer 8:4			stands 102:21	subsequent 34:22 51:11 53:4 56:11,13 98:25 114:6 115:20 116:24 118:16
schedule 53:13 121:23			Stang 8:7	subsequently 24:13 105:16
scheduled 55:21			start 12:14,16,25 95:16 112:6	
scheme 54:9				
scope 149:6,13				

subset 24:13 subsidiaries 62:12 93:13 subsidiary 46:15 47:10 substance 14:8 70:16 76:25 successfully 96:6 suffered 118:5 148:12 suggestion 49:23, 25 111:8 suit 78:7 summaries 69:22 summarize 123:17 summary 69:12 71:6 123:10 summation 106:14 summer 23:14 24:3 supervised 97:4 support 18:21 19:7 109:7,16 111:17 128:25 Surgent 69:4 sworn 98:16 <hr/> T <hr/> taking 66:8 talk 11:4,17 12:10,11 13:14 14:3,12,15 15:5 30:11,13 113:10 122:7 talked 43:4 79:15,20 150:25 talking 31:14 104:6 119:9 120:12,15 124:17 134:19 team 24:11 25:3,5,6, 8 79:18,24 teed 89:18 telling 74:19 80:23 Ten 60:16	ten-minute 60:19 112:3 term 110:25 134:10 145:14 termination 78:7 terminology 36:8 terms 9:16,22 95:17 110:10 122:17 144:24 145:12,21 147:7 151:4 Terry 45:24 46:2,9, 18,20 47:16 48:12 51:12,16 53:12 70:3 71:4 73:13,20 76:4, 14 77:20 118:15 testified 10:15 58:7 93:18 94:10,11 95:12 104:12 107:3 112:11 122:10 148:20 testifying 52:13 testimony 10:6 14:6 28:23 29:4 43:7 47:24 56:10 57:21 58:13 72:18,19 92:24 98:16 99:2 105:8,12 107:9 117:18 121:9 142:2 thesis 28:21 96:19 101:2 114:3 thing 12:9,20 128:20 things 39:5 43:25 107:10 127:8 thinks 82:23 Thomas 69:3,13,15 thought 105:24 118:10 120:20 135:10 146:17 till 60:22 time 12:3,6,17 25:23 26:2 30:10 33:6 34:15,17 56:19 60:23 85:2 88:6,7 90:13 94:18 97:11 99:9 101:17 103:4,8,13,24 105:7 107:5 114:7 125:25 151:25 timeline 114:18	times 102:13 103:16 104:23 titles 110:6 today 13:7,15 14:12, 16 72:21 75:14,25 117:25 today's 75:11 told 28:24 68:20 102:15,18 106:7,9 top 37:12 61:14 62:4 93:15 95:11 99:17 128:22 topics 14:12,16 99:21 total 65:18,20 112:20 totally 12:19 27:22 toxic 49:5,14,20 50:2 trading 119:25 127:7,10 transaction 27:6 40:18,22 41:10,19,25 103:5 transactions 54:21 95:18 96:4 98:19 transcript 10:9 153:23 transfer 63:8,11 110:6 127:25 129:10, 23 130:7,24 131:11, 25 133:6 135:20 136:11,23 137:2,14, 25 140:3 141:8,16 142:14,24 143:7,9,19 144:3,10 145:22 146:3 Transferee 132:15 transferred 51:22 126:4,19 127:15 138:17 146:5 147:6 transferring 123:23 126:12 140:10 144:22 transfers 47:14,15 48:11 55:13 132:14 treated 15:22	Trey 79:11,12 trim 109:19 TRO 115:18 116:24 Trust 8:17,18 trustee 35:9 36:13 52:23 95:25 96:23 97:7,16 Trustee's 96:25 trustees 62:14 turn 30:23 63:3 118:17 128:4 133:7 two-minute 147:23 two-thirds 38:25 <hr/> U <hr/> UBS 8:21 70:4 ultimate 74:2 76:4 103:10 111:6 ultimately 25:13 51:9 54:17 55:17 116:23 118:13 124:18 127:20 unanimous 42:23 unaudited 59:2 underlying 120:4 underling 31:8 35:4 underlying 11:7 13:18 19:24 31:10, 14,16 32:19 33:3 36:9,23 40:21 41:16 51:14 53:5 56:22 70:16 74:2 93:2 98:10,13 105:4 114:2 116:19 118:19 119:5, 22 underneath 35:19 understand 11:23 12:4,7 34:25 95:3 98:15 120:23 131:8, 21 133:24 135:16 138:10 151:20 152:6 understanding 35:11 36:21 39:24 40:17 42:2,9,12,15 43:20 44:10 46:7 47:6,9,18 51:2,9 65:21 71:15 73:10,17 75:23 82:15 83:5 91:8,12 93:12 110:9 113:15 115:17 121:11 125:16 126:2 129:16,20 130:5,15 131:23 132:5,7,9,21 133:5 136:9,18,21 142:18 145:24 146:19 147:3 148:25 151:14 153:5 understood 31:19 62:11 118:10 142:8 undertaken 56:16 undertaking 45:23 undertook 47:13 48:10 unequivocally 49:18 unsecured 109:25 123:20 124:6,25 125:18 upside 125:21 <hr/> V <hr/> vague 104:9 valuation 59:7 valued 125:18 variety 30:24 vehicle 26:18,22 27:2 vehicles 16:19 18:2 32:22 viability 77:17 video 121:20 view 54:22 105:7,13 116:9 131:15 137:10 viewed 97:16 VIII 15:2 virtue 119:21 vote 42:23 110:16,20 111:17
--	--	--	---

voting 62:5,24	118:6,25 119:17 120:17 121:8 123:11 124:9,15 125:5,14 126:23 127:18 128:12 129:13,25 130:10 131:12 132:3, 18,24 134:3 135:4 136:12 137:5,18 138:6,19 140:13,24 141:11,25 142:17 143:3,11,21 144:11 145:2,15 146:7,22 147:9,21,25 148:14 149:2,4,11,19 150:3, 14,21 151:9,17,21 152:7,17,25 153:14	worked 42:10 works 11:24 worth 28:25 worthless 108:17 wrap 112:4 151:25 written 39:17 42:25 43:10 75:4,16 82:7 142:13,22 143:5 144:2,22 145:25 wrong 120:25 wrongful 78:7
<hr/> W <hr/>	<hr/> Y <hr/>	<hr/> Z <hr/>
Wall 76:9 80:13,18 81:15 wanted 45:13 94:12 97:16 104:13 122:9 Watkins 8:20 Wayne 13:4 week 93:23 94:23 95:8 104:15 weekly 88:10,16 89:3 weeks 51:25 80:2 83:12 122:25 Weisgerber 8:9,10, 25 9:25 13:20 14:9 15:11 29:3,14 30:3 31:6 32:8,17 33:17 34:13,20 35:10,16 36:2,17 37:6 39:10 40:12 41:3,11,21 42:3,11 43:12,21 44:18 45:5 46:5,12 47:2,23 48:16 49:16 50:19 51:5 52:9,25 53:18,25 54:14 56:9 57:7,20 58:12 59:19, 24 60:4,16 61:19 62:22 63:25 64:7,19 65:2,15,22 66:6 67:3, 8,16,21 69:18 70:10, 23 71:7 72:4,12 73:7 74:24 75:8,19 76:15 77:3,12,22 78:10,16 80:9 81:5,24 82:10, 18 83:2,15 85:24 86:9,25 87:6,10,24 88:13,21 89:4,12 90:9,18 91:3,15,23 92:12,23 93:25 94:13,24 95:21 96:14 97:12,23 98:20 99:6, 13 100:14,23 101:10, 13,23 102:10,18 103:14 104:3,7,21 105:11 106:17 107:2, 16,24 108:18,25 110:11,22 111:3,10, 18 112:25 113:4,16 114:13,23 115:12 116:5,17 117:15	wholly-owned 62:12 85:2 Willard 25:2 68:21 69:3 79:9,16 William 93:17 94:6 104:11 Wilson 8:2 9:6 10:7, 17 14:2,13,14 15:24 16:10 17:5 18:17,24 19:9 20:18 21:5 22:13,21 33:20,23 42:8 48:4 50:23 52:18 53:21,22 57:24 59:22 60:2,9,14,21, 25 61:4,11 63:2 67:24 72:20 74:16 75:13 76:6 78:20 82:14,21 83:17,24 84:8 86:15 88:23 89:23 90:5 93:7 94:15 95:3 99:16,24 102:14 103:18 105:21 106:5,10,24 107:12 109:3,13 112:2,9 121:12 148:16,18 149:8,16 152:3,10,14 153:12, 20 Wilson's 148:2 Winograd 8:7 witness' 9:7 wondering 151:22 words 74:18 work 122:21	y'all 60:10,14 years 30:6 57:10 York 10:14 Ziehl 8:8 Zoom 12:6,10 128:14

EXHIBIT 8

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No.143717) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 266326) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (NY Bar No. 5612569) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
Facsimile: (310) 201-0760

HAYWARD PLLC

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for the Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:)	Chapter 11
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P., ¹)	Case No. 19-34054-sgj11
Debtor.)	Re: Docket Nos. 1625, 1697, 1706, 1707

**DEBTOR'S OMNIBUS REPLY IN SUPPORT OF DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR
ENTRY OF AN ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT WITH HARBOURVEST
(CLAIM NOS. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154), AND AUTHORIZING ACTIONS
CONSISTENT THEREWITH**

¹ The Debtor's last four digits of its taxpayer identification number are (6725). The headquarters and service address for the above-captioned Debtor is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201.



The above-captioned debtor and debtor-in-possession (the “Debtor”) hereby submits this reply (the “Reply”) in support of its *Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim No.143,147, 149, 150, 153, 154), and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1625] (the “Motion”).² In further support of the Motion, the Debtor respectfully states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. If granted, the Motion will resolve a \$300 million general unsecured claim against the Debtor’s estate for less than \$16.8 million in actual value.³ The settlement is another solid achievement for the Debtor and – not surprisingly – is opposed by no one except Mr. Dondero and entities affiliated with him.

2. As discussed in the Motion, in November 2017, HarbourVest invested \$80 million in exchange for a 49.98% membership interest in HCLOF – an entity managed by a subsidiary of the Debtor. The balance of HCLOF’s interests are held by CLO Holdco, Ltd. (an entity affiliated with Mr. Dondero), the Debtor, and certain of the Debtor’s employees. Subsequent to its investment in HCLOF, HarbourVest incurred substantial losses on its investment in HCLOF and filed claims against the Debtor’s estate.

3. HarbourVest asserts claims for fraud, fraudulent inducement, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty

² All capitalized terms used but not defined herein have the meanings given to them in the Motion.

³ Under the proposed settlement, HarbourVest would receive an allowed, general unsecured claim of \$45 million and an allowed, subordinated claim of \$35 million. Based on the estimated recovery for general unsecured creditors of 87.44% (which is a recovery based on certain outdated assumptions discussed *infra*), HarbourVest’s \$45 million general unsecured claim is estimated to be worth approximately \$39.3 million and the \$35 million subordinated claim, which is junior to the general unsecured claim, is currently estimated to have value only if there are litigation recoveries. In addition, HarbourVest is transferring to an affiliate of the Debtor its interest in HCLOF, which is estimated to be worth approximately \$22.5 million. Thus, HarbourVest’s estimated recovery on its general unsecured and subordinated claims is estimated at approximately \$16.8 million on a net economic basis. This estimate, however, is dated and is based on the claims that were settled as of the filing of the Debtor’s plan in November 2020.

and unfair prejudice (under Guernsey law), violations of state securities laws, and RICO. In furtherance of these claims, HarbourVest alleges it was misled by the Debtor and its employees, including Mr. Scott Ellington (then the Debtor's general counsel), and that subsequent to investing in HCLOF, Mr. Dondero and the Debtor used HCLOF both as a piggybank to fund the litigation against Acis Capital Management, L.P. ("Acis") and as a scapegoat for the Debtor's litigation strategy, in each case to HarbourVest's substantial detriment.

4. Specifically, HarbourVest alleges that:

- the Debtor and its employees, including Mr. Ellington, misled HarbourVest about its intentions with respect to Mr. Terry's arbitration award against Acis and orchestrated a series of fraudulent transfers and corporate restructurings, the true purpose of which was to denude Acis of assets and make it judgment proof;
- the Debtor and its employees, including Mr. Ellington, misled HarbourVest as to the intent and true purpose of these restructurings and led HarbourVest to believe that Mr. Terry's claims against Acis were meritless and a simple employment dispute that would not affect HarbourVest's investment;
- the Debtor, through Mr. Dondero, improperly exercised control over or misled HCLOF's Guernsey-based board of directors to cause HCLOF to engage in unnecessary, unwarranted, and resource-draining litigation against Acis;
- the Debtor improperly caused HCLOF to pay substantial legal fees of various entities in the Acis bankruptcy that were unwarranted, imprudent, and not properly chargeable to HCLOF; and
- the Debtor used HarbourVest as a scapegoat in its litigation against Acis by asserting that the Debtor's improper conduct and scorched-earth litigation strategy was at HarbourVest's request, which was untrue.

5. The Debtor believed, and continues to believe, that it has viable defenses to HarbourVest's claims. Nevertheless, those defenses would be subject to substantial factual disputes and would require expensive and time-consuming litigation that would likely be resolved only after a lengthy trial all while the Debtor (or its successor) assumes the risk that the defenses might fail. The evidence will show that the proposed settlement is the product of substantial, arm's length – and sometimes quite heated – negotiations between and among the

principals and their counsel. The evidence will also show that one of HarbourVest's primary concerns in settling its claim was that part of that settlement would include the extrication of HarbourVest from the Highland web of entities and the related litigation. The proposed settlement accomplishes that and does so in compliance with HCLOF's governing agreements.

6. Pursuant to the proposed settlement, (a) HarbourVest will receive (i) an allowed, general unsecured claim in the amount of \$45 million, and (ii) an allowed, subordinated claim in the amount of \$35 million; (b) HarbourVest will transfer its 49.98% interest in HCLOF (valued at approximately \$22.5 million) to a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Debtor; and (c) the parties will exchange mutual and general releases. The Debtor believes that the proposed settlement is reasonable and results from the valid and proper exercise of its business judgment. And the Debtor's creditors apparently agree. None of the major parties-in-interest or creditors in this case has objected to the Motion: not the Committee, the Redeemer Committee, Acis, Patrick Daugherty, or UBS.

7. In distinction, the only objecting parties are Mr. Dondero, his family trusts (the Dugaboy Investment Trust ("Dugaboy") and Get Good Trust ("Get Good," and together with Dugaboy, the "Trusts")), and CLO Holdco (a wholly-owned subsidiary of Mr. Dondero's Charitable Donor Advised Fund, L.P. (the "DAF")) (collectively, the "Objectors"). Each of the Objectors has only the most tenuous economic interest in and connection to the Debtor's settlement with HarbourVest. Each of the Objectors is also controlled directly or indirectly by Mr. Dondero who has coordinated each of the Objectors litigation strategies against the Debtor.⁴ Mr. Dondero's efforts to litigate every issue in this case – directly and by proxy – should be rebuffed, and the objections overruled. The following is a brief summary of the objections.

⁴ See *Debtor's Amended Witness and Exhibit List with Respect to Evidentiary Hearing to be Held on January 8, 2021* [Adv. Pro. 20-3190-sgj, Docket No. 46], Exhibit Q.

<u>Pleading</u>	<u>Objection/Reservation</u>	<u>Response</u>
<i>Objection of James Dondero</i> [Docket No. 1697] (the “ <u>Dondero Objection</u> ”)	Because HarbourVest was damaged by the injunction entered in Acis, the settlement seeks to revisit this Court’s rulings in Acis.	Mr. Dondero is misdirecting the Court. HarbourVest’s claim arises from the misrepresentations of Mr. Dondero, Mr. Ellington, and others, not this Court’s rulings in Acis, including the failure to disclose the fraudulent transfer of assets.
	The settlement is not fair and equitable because it does not address (1) Acis’s mismanagement, (2) how the Debtor is liable for HarbourVest’s damages, (3) the success on the merits, (4) the costs of litigation, and (5) the Debtor’s ability to realize the value of the HCLOF interests in light of the Acis injunction.	Mr. Dondero ignores the dangers of the litigation and HarbourVest’s claims against the estate for misrepresentation and overestimates the ability to resolve the litigation. The Debtor has assessed the value of the HCLOF interests in light of all factors, including the Acis injunction.
	The HarbourVest settlement represents a substantial windfall to HarbourVest.	Mr. Dondero ignores the economics of this case, which have value breaking in Class 8 (General Unsecured Claims). The value of the settlement is not \$60 million; it is approximately \$16.8 million against a claim of \$300 million. There is no windfall.
	The HarbourVest settlement is improper gerrymandering because it provides HarbourVest with a general unsecured claim and a subordinated claim in order to secure votes for the plan.	The HarbourVest settlement provides for the resolution of HarbourVest’s claim. It is nonsensical to think that the Debtor would reach a settlement with HarbourVest that would include HarbourVest’s rejection of the Debtor’s plan, and there is nothing wrong with requiring acceptance of a plan as part of a settlement. Further, the Debtor does not need HarbourVest’s Class 9 vote to confirm a plan.
<i>Objection of the Dugaboy Investment Trust and Get Good Trust</i> [Docket No. 1706] (the “ <u>Trusts Objection</u> ”)	The settlement represents a radical change in the Debtor’s earlier position on the HarbourVest settlement.	Mr. Dondero ignores the dangers of the litigation and HarbourVest’s claims against the estate for misrepresentation and overestimates the ability to resolve the litigation.
	The settlement appears to buy HarbourVest’s vote.	The HarbourVest settlement provides for the resolution of HarbourVest’s claim. It is nonsensical to think that the Debtor would reach a settlement with HarbourVest that would include HarbourVest’s rejection of the Debtor’s plan, and there is nothing wrong with requiring acceptance of a plan as part of a settlement. Further, the Debtor does not need HarbourVest’s Class 9 vote to confirm a plan.
	No information is provided as to whether the Debtor can acquire HarbourVest’s interest in HCLOF or the value of that interest to the estate.	As discussed below, the HCLOF interest will be transferred to a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Debtor. Mr. Seery will testify as to the benefit of the HCLOF interests to the estate.
<i>Objection of CLO Holdco</i> [Docket No. 1707] (“ <u>CLOH Objection</u> ”)	HarbourVest cannot transfer its interests in HCLOF unless it complies with the right of first refusal.	CLO Holdco misinterprets the operative agreements and tries to create ambiguity where none exists.

8. These objections are just the latest objections filed by Mr. Dondero and his related entities to any attempt by the Debtor to resolve this case,⁵ including the Debtor's settlement with Acis [Docket No. 1087] and the seven separate objections filed by Mr. Dondero and his related entities to the *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1472] (the "Plan").⁶ It will not shock this Court to hear that each of the Objectors is also objecting to the Plan. In contradistinction, the Debtor has heard this Court's admonishments about old Highland's culture of litigation as evidenced by this case, Acis's bankruptcy, and beyond. Although the Debtor has vigorously contested claims when appropriate, the Debtor has also sought to settle claims and limit the senseless fighting. The Debtor has successfully resolved the largest claims against the estate, including the claims of the Redeemer Committee, Acis, and, as recently announced to this Court, UBS. The Debtor would ask this Court to see through the pretense of the Dondero-related entities' objections to the HarbourVest settlement and approve it as a valid exercise of the Debtor's business judgment.

⁵ As an example of Mr. Dondero's litigiousness, on January 12, 2021, Mr. Dondero filed notice that he will be appealing the preliminary injunction entered against him earlier on January 12, 2021.

⁶ (1) *James Dondero's Objection to Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1661]; (2) *Objection to Confirmation of the Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by Get Good Trust, The Dugaboy Investment Trust)* [Docket No. 1667]; (3) *Senior Employees' Limited Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by Scott Ellington, Thomas Sargent, Frank Waterhouse, Isaac Leventon)* [Docket No. 1669]; (4) *Objection to Confirmation of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (filed by Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., Highland Fixed Income Fund, Highland Funds I and its series, Highland Funds II and its series, Highland Global Allocation Fund, Highland Healthcare Opportunities Fund, Highland Income Fund, Highland Merger Arbitrage Fund, Highland Opportunistic Credit Fund, Highland Small-Cap Equity Fund, Highland Socially Responsible Equity Fund, Highland Total Return Fund, Highland/iBoxx Senior Loan ETF, NexPoint Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Capital, Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Strategies Fund, NexPoint Strategic Opportunities Fund)* [Docket No. 1670]; (5) *NexPoint Real Estate Partners LLC's Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by NexPoint Real Estate Partners LLC f/k/a HCRE Partners LLC)* [Docket No. 1673]; (6) *CLO Holdco, Ltd.'s Joinder to Objection to Confirmation of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. and Supplemental Objections to Plan Confirmation* [Docket No. 1675]; and (7) *NexBank's Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by NexBank Title, Inc., NexBank Securities, Inc., NexBank Capital, Inc., and NexBank)* [Docket No. 1676].

REPLY

A. Standing

9. **James Dondero.** In the Dondero Objection, Mr. Dondero asserts he is a “creditor, indirect equity security holder, and party in interest” in the Debtor’s bankruptcy. While that claim is ostensibly true, it is tenuous at best. On April 8, 2020, Mr. Dondero filed three unliquidated, contingent claims that he promised to update “in the next ninety days.”⁷ More than nine months later, Mr. Dondero has yet to “update” those claims to assert an actual claim against the Debtor’s estate.⁸

10. Mr. Dondero’s claim as an “indirect equity security holder” is also a stretch. Mr. Dondero holds no direct equity interest in the Debtor. Mr. Dondero instead owns 100% of Strand Advisors, Inc. (“Strand”), the Debtor’s general partner. Strand, however, holds only 0.25% of the total limited partnership interests in the Debtor through its ownership of Class A limited partnership interests. The Class A limited partnership interests are junior in priority of distribution to the Debtor’s Class B and Class C limited partnership interests. The Class A interests are also junior to all other claims filed against the Debtor. Finally, Mr. Dondero’s recovery on his indirect equity interest is junior to any claims against Strand itself. Consequently, before Mr. Dondero can recover on his “indirect” equity interest, the Debtor’s estate must be solvent, priority distributions to Class B and Class C creditors must be satisfied, and all claims against Strand must be satisfied.

11. **Dugaboy and Get Good.** Dugaboy and Get Good are sham Dondero “trusts” with only the most attenuated standing. Dugaboy has filed three proofs of claim [Claim Nos. 113; 131; 177]. In two of these claims, Dugaboy argues that (1) the Debtor is liable to Dugaboy

⁷ Mr. Dondero filed two other proofs of claim that he has since withdrawn with prejudice. See Docket No. 1460.

⁸ Without knowing the nature of the “updates,” the Debtor does not concede that any “updates” would have been procedurally proper and reserves the right to object to any proposed amendment to Mr. Dondero’s claims.

for its postpetition mismanagement of the Highland Multi Strategy Credit Fund, L.P., and (2) this Court should pierce the corporate veil and allow Dugaboy to sue the Debtor for a claim it ostensibly has against the Highland Select Equity Master Fund, L.P. – a Debtor-managed investment vehicle. The Debtor believes that each of the foregoing claims is frivolous and has objected to them. [Docket No. 906].

12. In its third claim, Dugaboy asserts a claim against the Debtor arising from its Class A limited partnership interest in the Debtor (which represents just 0.1866% of the total limited partnership interests in the Debtor). Similarly, Get Good filed three proofs of claim [Claim Nos. 120; 128; 129] arising from its prior ownership of limited partnership interests in the Debtor. Because each these claims arises from an equity interest, the Debtor will seek to subordinate them under 11 U.S.C. § 510 at the appropriate time. As set forth above, these interests are out of the money and are not expected to receive any economic recovery.

13. Consequently, Mr. Dondero, Dugaboy, and Get Good’s standing to object to the HarbourVest settlement is attenuated and their chances of recovery in this case are extremely speculative at best. *See In re Kutner*, 3 B.R. 422, 425 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 1980) (finding that a party had standing only when it had a “pecuniary interest . . . directly affected by the bankruptcy proceeding”); *see also In re Flintkote Co.*, 486 B.R. 99, 114-15 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012), *aff’d*. 526 B.R. 515 (D. Del. 2014) (a claim that is speculative cannot confer party in interest standing). Mr. Dondero, Dugaboy, and Get Good’s minimal interest in the estate should not allow them to overrule the estate’s business judgment or veto settlements with creditors, especially when no actual creditors and constituents have objected. “[A] bankruptcy judge must not blindly follow the hue and cry of the most vocal special interest groups; rather, [the judge] should consider all salient factors . . . and . . . act to further the diverse interests of the debtor, creditors and equity

holders, alike.” *In re Lionel*, 722 F.2d 1063, 1071 (2d Cir. 1983).

B. Mr. Dondero’s Objection and his “Trusts” Objection Are Without Merit

14. As discussed in the Motion, under applicable Fifth Circuit precedent, a bankruptcy court may approve a compromise or settlement as long as the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interest of the estate. *See, e.g., In re Age Ref. Inc.*, 801 F.3d 530, 540 (5th Cir. 2015). In making this determination, courts look to the following factors:

- probability of success in the litigation, with due consideration for the uncertainty of law and fact;
- complexity and likely duration of the litigation and any attendant expense, inconvenience and delay; and
- all other factors bearing on the wisdom of the compromise, including (i) “the paramount interest of creditors with proper deference to their reasonable views” and (ii) whether the settlement is the product of arm’s length bargaining and not of fraud or collusion.

Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors v. Cajun Elec. Power Coop. (In re Cajun Elec. Power Coop.), 119 F.3d 349, 356 (5th Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). *See also Age Ref. Inc.*, 801 F.3d at 540; *Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co. v. United Cos. Fin. Corp. (In re Foster Mortgage Corp.)*, 68 F.3d 914, 918 (5th Cir. 1995).

15. **The Settlement Seeks to Revisit the Acis Orders.** In the Dondero Objection, Mr. Dondero argues that HarbourVest’s claim is based on the financial harm caused to HarbourVest from Acis’s bankruptcy and the orders entered in the Acis bankruptcy. Mr. Dondero extrapolates from this that HarbourVest is seeking to challenge this Court’s rulings in Acis. (Dondero Obj., ¶¶ 17-20) Mr. Dondero misinterprets HarbourVest’s claims and the dangers such claims pose to the Debtor’s estate.

16. HarbourVest’s claims are for fraud, fraudulent inducement, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty

and unfair prejudice (under Guernsey law), violations of state securities laws, and RICO. HarbourVest is not arguing that Acis or this Court caused its damages; HarbourVest is arguing that *the Debtor* – led by Mr. Dondero – (a) misled HarbourVest as to the nature of Mr. Terry’s claims against the Debtor and the litigation with Acis, (b) knowingly and intentionally failed to disclose that the Debtor was engaged in the fraudulent transfer of assets to prevent Mr. Terry from collecting his judgment, and (c) that *the Debtor* – under the control of Mr. Dondero – improperly engaged in a crusade against Mr. Terry and Acis, which substantially damaged HarbourVest and its investment in HCLOF, in each case in order to induce HarbourVest to invest in HCLOF.

17. Again, HarbourVest does not contend that Acis caused its damages. Rather, HarbourVest contends that the fraudulent transfer of assets as part of the Debtor’s crusade against Mr. Terry and Acis and the false statements and omissions about those matters caused HarbourVest to make an investment it would never have made had Mr. Dondero and the Debtor been honest and transparent. The Acis litigation – in HarbourVest’s estimation – never should have happened. Acis did not cause HarbourVest’s damages. Mr. Dondero’s crusade against Mr. Terry and the Debtor’s allegedly fraudulent statements to HarbourVest about the fraudulent transfers, Mr. Terry and Acis caused HarbourVest’s damages.

18. **The HarbourVest Claim Lacks Merit.** In their objections, Mr. Dondero and the Trusts argue that the HarbourVest settlement is not fair and equitable and not in the best interests of the estate because (a) it does not address the Debtor’s arguments against the HarbourVest claims and (b) there is a lack of pending litigation seeking to narrow the claims against the estate. These arguments only summarily address the first two factors of *Cajun Electric*, which deal with success in the litigation, and, in doing so, mischaracterize the dangers to the Debtor’s estate

posed by HarbourVest's claims. (Dondero Obj., ¶¶ 21-25; Trusts Obj., ¶ 18(a))

19. Both the Dondero Objection and – to a much lesser extent – the “Trusts” Objection allege that (a) HarbourVest's losses were caused by Acis and its (mis)management of HCLOF's investments (Dondero Obj., ¶¶ 22, 24), (b) there is no contract that supports HarbourVest's claims (Dondero Obj. ¶ 23; Trusts Obj., ¶ 18(a)), (c) there is no causal connection between HarbourVest's losses and the Debtor's conduct (Dondero Obj., ¶ 24), and (d) the Debtor should litigate all or a portion of HarbourVest's claim before settling (Dondero Obj., ¶ 25). Again, though, as set forth above, both Mr. Dondero and the “Trusts” seek to shift the cause of HarbourVest's damages away from the Debtor's misrepresentations and to Mr. Terry's management of HCLOF's investments. This is simple misdirection.

20. HarbourVest's claims are that it invested in HCLOF based on the Debtor's fraudulent misrepresentations. Fraudulent misrepresentation sounds in tort, not contract. *See, e.g., Clark v. Constellation Brands, Inc.*, 348 Fed. Appx. 19, 21 (5th Cir. 2009) (referring to party's claim based on fraudulent misrepresentation as a tort); *Eastman Chem. Co. v. Niro, Inc.*, 80 F. Supp. 2d 712, 717 (S.D. Tex. 2000) (noting that party had common law duty not to commit intentional tort of fraudulent misrepresentation). There is thus no need for HarbourVest to point to a contractual provision to support its claim.⁹ Moreover, in order to defend against HarbourVest's claims, the Debtor would need to elicit evidence showing that its employees did not make misrepresentations to HarbourVest. Such a defense would require the Debtor to rely on the veracity of Mr. Ellington's testimony, among others. That is a high hurdle, and no reasonable person would expect the Debtor to stake the resolution of HarbourVest's \$300 million claim on the Debtor's ability to convince this Court that Mr. Ellington was telling HarbourVest

⁹ Subsequent to filing the Motion, the Objectors requested all agreements between HarbourVest, HCLOF, and the Debtor, and such agreements were provided.

the truth. This is especially true in light of the evidence supporting Mr. Ellington's recent termination for cause and the evidence recently provided by HarbourVest supporting its claim for fraudulent misrepresentations.

21. Finally, neither Mr. Dondero nor the "Trusts" even address the third factor analyzed by the Fifth Circuit: all other factors bearing on the wisdom of the compromise, including "the paramount interest of creditors with proper deference to their reasonable views." This is telling because no creditor or party in interest has objected to the settlement. Mr. Dondero and his proxies' preference for constant litigation should not outweigh the preference of the Debtor and its creditors for a reasonable and expeditious settlement of HarbourVest's claims.

22. **The HarbourVest Settlement Is a Windfall to HarbourVest.** Both the Dondero Objection and the "Trusts" Objection argue that the HarbourVest settlement represents a substantial windfall to HarbourVest. Both Mr. Dondero and the "Trusts" ignore the facts. Specifically, Mr. Dondero argues that HarbourVest is receiving \$60 million dollars in *actual* value for its claims. Mr. Dondero's contention, however, wrongly assumes that both the \$45 million general unsecured claim and the \$35 million subordinated claim provided to HarbourVest under the settlement will be paid 100% in full and that HarbourVest will receive \$80 million in cash. From that \$80 million, Mr. Dondero subtracts \$20 million, which represents the value Mr. Dondero ascribes to HarbourVest's interests in HCLOF that are being transferred to the Debtor. Mr. Dondero's math ignores the reality of this case.

23. The Debtor very clearly disclosed in the projections filed with the *Disclosure Statement for the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.*, [Docket No. 1473] (the "Projections") that general unsecured claims would receive an 87.44% recovery *only if* the claims of UBS, HarbourVest, Integrated Financial Associates, Inc., Mr.

Daugherty, and the Hunter Mountain Investment Trust were zero. Because of the Debtor's success in settling litigation, that assumption is proving to be inaccurate. Regardless, even if general unsecured claims receive a recovery of 87.44%, because the subordinated claims are junior to the general unsecured claims, the subordinated claims' projected recovery is currently zero. As such, assuming the HCLOF's interests are worth \$22.5 million,¹⁰ the actual recovery to HarbourVest will be less than \$16.8 million. This is not a windfall. HarbourVest's investment in HCLOF was \$80 million and its claim against the estate was over \$300 million. The settlement represents a substantial discount.

24. **Improper Gerrymandering and/or Vote Buying.** Each of Mr. Dondero and the Trusts argue in one form or another that the HarbourVest settlement is improper as it provides HarbourVest a windfall on its claims in exchange for HarbourVest voting to approve the Plan. These unsubstantiated allegations of vote buying should be disregarded. As an initial matter, and as set forth above, HarbourVest is *not* getting a windfall. HarbourVest is accepting a substantial discount in the settlement. HarbourVest's incentive to support the Plan comes from HarbourVest's determination that the Plan is in its best interests. There is also nothing shocking about a settling creditor supporting a plan. Indeed, it would be nonsensical for a creditor to settle its claims and then object to the plan that would pay those claims.

25. More importantly, HarbourVest's votes in Class 9 (Subordinated Claims) are not needed to confirm the Plan. As will be set forth in the voting declaration, Class 2 (Frontier Secured Claim), Class 7 (Convenience Claims), and Class 8 (General Unsecured Claims) have voted in favor of the Plan.¹¹ In brief, the Plan was approved without HarbourVest's Class 9 vote,

¹⁰ It is currently anticipated that Mr. James P. Seery, Jr., the Debtor's chief executive officer and chief restructuring officer, will testify as to the value of the HCLOF interests to the Debtor's estate.

¹¹ The Debtor anticipates that Mr. Dondero and his related entities will argue that neither Class 7 nor Class 8 voted to accept the Plan because of the votes cast against the Plan in those Classes by current and former Debtor

and the Debtor, therefore, has no need to “buy” HarbourVest’s Class 9 claims. Accordingly, any claims of gerrymandering or vote buying are without merit.

C. CLOH Objection

26. CLO Holdco (and to a much lesser extent, the “Trusts”) object to HarbourVest’s transfer of its interests in HCLOF as part of the settlement. Currently, the settlement contemplates that HarbourVest will transfer 100% of its collective interests in HCLOF to HCMLP Investments, LLC (“HCMLPI”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Debtor. As set forth in the *Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.* (which was appended as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement) [Docket No. 1631-1], each of the Debtor, HarbourVest, Highland HCF Advisors, Ltd. (HCLOF’s investment manager) (“HHCFA”), and HCLOF agree that HarbourVest is entitled to transfer its interests to HCMLPI pursuant to that certain *Members Agreement Relating to the Company*, dated November 15, 2017 (the “Members Agreement”),¹² without offering that interest to other investors in HCLOF.

27. The *only* party to object to the transfer of HarbourVest’s interests in HCLOF to HCMLPI is CLO Holdco. CLO Holdco holds approximately a 49.02% interest in HCLOF and is the wholly-owned subsidiary of the DAF, Mr. Dondero’s donor-advised fund. CLO Holdco argues that the Member Agreement requires HarbourVest to offer its interest first to the other investors in HCLOF before it can transfer its interests to HCMLPI. In so arguing, CLO Holdco attempts to create ambiguity in an unambiguous contract and to use that ambiguity to disrupt the Debtor’s settlement with HarbourVest.

28. As an initial matter, the Debtor and CLO Holdco agree that the transfer of HarbourVest’s interests in HCLOF to HCMLPI is governed by Article 6 (Transfers or Disposals

employees, including Mr. Ellington and Mr. Isaac Leventon. The Debtor will demonstrate at confirmation that those objections are without merit and that Class 7 and Class 8 voted to accept the Plan.

¹² A true and accurate copy of the Members Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

of Shares) of the Members Agreement (an agreement governed by Guernsey law). (CLOH Obj., ¶ 3) The parties diverge, however, as to how to interpret Article 6. The Debtor, as set forth below, believes Article 6 is clear in that it allows HarbourVest to transfer its interests in HCLOF to any “Affiliate of an initial Member party” without requiring the right of first refusal in Section 6.2 of the Members Agreement. CLO Holdco’s position appears to be that the Members Agreement, despite its clear language, should be interpreted as limiting transfers to an “initial Member’s *own* affiliates” and that any other transfer requires the consent of HHCFA and satisfaction of the right of first refusal. (*Id.* (emphasis added)) CLO Holdco’s reading is contrary to the actual language of the Members Agreement.

29. First, Section 6.1 of the Members Agreement provides, in pertinent part:

[REDACTED]

(Members Agmt, § 6.1 (emphasis added)) Under the Members Agreement, “Affiliate” is defined, in pertinent part, as “[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(*Id.*, § 1.1) A “Member” in turn is a [REDACTED].” The “initial Member[s]” are the initial Members of HCLOF listed on the first page of the Members Agreement and include the Debtor, HarbourVest, and CLO Holdco.

30. As such, under the plain language of Section 6.1, HarbourVest is entitled – without the consent of any party – to “Transfer” its interests in HCLOF to an “Affiliate” of any of the Debtor, HarbourVest, or CLO Holdco. And that is exactly what is contemplated by the settlement. HarbourVest is transferring its interests to HCMLPI, a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of the Debtor, and therefore an “Affiliate” of the Debtor. That transfer is indisputably

allowed under Section 6.1; it is a transfer to an “Affiliate of an initial Member.” CLO Holdco may, tongue in cheek, call this structure “convenient” but that sarcasm is an attempt to avoid the fact that the Members Agreement clearly allows HarbourVest to transfer its interest to HCMLPI without the consent of any party.¹³ The fact that CLO Holdco does not now like the language it previously agreed to when CLO Holdco and the Debtor were both controlled by Mr. Dondero is not a reason to re-write Section 6.1 of the Members Agreement.

31. Second, Section 6.2 of the Members Agreement is also unambiguous and, by its plain language, allows HarbourVest to “Transfer” its interests in HCLOF to “Affiliates of an initial Member” (*i.e.*, HCMLPI) without having to first offer those interests to the other Members (such obligation, the “ROFO”). CLO Holdco attempts to create ambiguity in Section 6.2 by arguing that it must be read in conjunction with Section 6.1 and that interpreting the plain language of Section 6.2 to allow HarbourVest to transfer its interests to HCMLPI without restriction makes certain other language surplus and meaningless. (CLOH Obj., ¶ 11-13) Again, CLO Holdco is attempting to create controversy and ambiguity where none exists.

32. Section 6.2 of the Members Agreement provides, in pertinent part:

[REDACTED]

(Members Agmt., § 6.2 (emphasis added)) Like Section 6.1, Section 6.2 is clear on its face. It exempts from the requirement to comply with the ROFO two categories of “Transfers”: (1) Transfers to “affiliates of an initial Member” from Members *other than* CLO Holdco and the

¹³ Although HHCFA’s consent is not necessary for HarbourVest to transfer its interests to HCMLPI, HHCFA will consent to the transfer.

“Highland Principals” (*i.e.*, the Debtor and certain of its employees)¹⁴ and (2) Transfers from CLO Holdco or a Highland Principal to the Debtor, the Debtor’s “Affiliates,” or another Highland Principal. The fact that a narrower exemption is provided to CLO Holdco and the Debtor than to HarbourVest (or any other Member) under Section 6.2 is of no moment; the language says what it says and was agreed to by all Members, including CLO Holdco, when they executed the Members Agreement.

33. In addition, and although not relevant, the language of Section 6.2 makes sense in the context of the deal. Although CLO Holdco and the Debtor may have disclaimed an “Affiliate” relationship, they are related through Mr. Dondero and invest side by side with the Debtor in multiple deals.¹⁵ The different standards in Section 6.2 serve to ensure that HarbourVest’s (or any successor to HarbourVest) right to Transfer its shares without satisfying the ROFO is limited to three parties: (i) HarbourVest’s Affiliates, (ii) the Debtor’s Affiliates, and (iii) CLO Holdco’s Affiliates. This restriction keeps the relative voting power of each Member static and ensures that CLO Holdco and the Debtor, together, will *always* have more than fifty percent of HCLOF’s total interests and that HarbourVest will *always* have less than fifty percent. This counterintuitively also explains the greater restrictions placed on CLO Holdco and the “Highland Principals.” The Highland Principals include certain Debtor employees. Those employees – as well as CLO Holdco and the Debtor – are prohibited from transferring their HCLOF interests outside of the Dondero family. This restriction makes sense. If, for example, a Debtor employee wanted to transfer its interests to an Affiliate of HarbourVest, HarbourVest could have more than fifty percent of the HCLOF interests because of the thinness

¹⁴ “Highland Principals” means: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (Members Agmt., § 1.1)

¹⁵ There can be no real dispute that Mr. Dondero effectively controls CLO Holdco.

of the Dondero-family's majority (approximately 0.2%). At the time the Members Agreement was executed, CLO Holdco and the Debtor were under common control. Section 6.2 preserves those related entities' control over HCLOF by restricting transactions that would transfer that control unless the ROFO is complied with.

34. As such, and notwithstanding CLO Holdco's protestations, Section 6.1 and Section 6.2 are consistent as written and clear on their face. This consistency is further evidenced by HCLOF's Articles of Incorporation¹⁶ and HCLOF's offering memorandum, which each include language identical to Section 6.1 and 6.2 of the Members Agreement.¹⁷ It seems highly unlikely, if not implausible, that sophisticated parties such as CLO Holdco would include the exact same language in six separate places over three documents without a reason for that language and without the intent that such language be interpreted as it is clearly written – not as CLO Holdco now wants it to be interpreted. Accordingly, since HarbourVest is transferring its interests to HCMLPI, an Affiliate of an initial Member, the plain language of Section 6.2

¹⁶ See Articles of Incorporation, adopted November 15, 2017, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

[REDACTED]

(Articles of Incorporation, § 18.1)

[REDACTED]

(*Id.*, § 18.2)

¹⁷ See Offering Memorandum, dated November 15, 2017, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

[REDACTED]

(Offering Memorandum, page 89)

exempts HarbourVest from having to comply with the ROFO.

35. Third, and finally, CLO Holdco makes the nonsensical argument that because Section 6.2 provides different treatment to similarly situated Members that this Court should re-write Section 6.2. (CLOH Obj., ¶¶ 15-17) Contracts provide different treatment to ostensibly similarly situated parties all the time and no one objects that that creates an absurd result. It just means that different parties bargained for and received different rights.

36. CLO Holdco's attempt to justify why this Court should re-write the Members Agreement to correct the "disparate treatment" is also unavailing. As an example of the absurd result caused by the "disparate treatment," CLO Holdco states: "[B]ecause the HarbourVest Members are technically Affiliates of an initial member (each other), they could obtain control of all of the interests in HCLOF without any Member receiving a Right of First Refusal for any transfer." (*Id.*, ¶ 16) The scenario posited by CLO Holdco, however, is *exactly* the scenario prevented by the clear language of Section 6.2. For HarbourVest to obtain control of HCLOF, it would – as a matter of mathematical necessity – need the interests held by CLO Holdco (49.02%) and/or the Highland Principals (1% in the aggregate). Section 6.2, however, *expressly* prohibits CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals from transferring their interests to HarbourVest or its Affiliates without satisfying the ROFO. As set forth above, it is Section 6.2 that prevents control from being transferred away from the Dondero family without compliance with the ROFO. In fact, Section 6.2 would only break down if the limiting language in Section 6.2 were read out of it in the manner advocated by CLO Holdco.

37. Ultimately, Article 6 of the Members Agreement is clear as written and expressly allows HarbourVest to transfer its interests to HCMLPI. If CLO Holdco had an objection to the rights provided to HarbourVest under the Members Agreement, CLO Holdco

should have raised that objection three and a half years ago before agreeing to the Members Agreement. CLO Holdco should not be allowed to create ambiguity in an unambiguous contract or to re-write that agreement to impose additional restrictions on HarbourVest. *See Clardy Mfg. Co. v. Marine Midland Bus. Loans Inc.*, 88 F.3d 347, 352 (5th Cir. 1996) (enforcing the “unambiguous language in a contract as written,” noting that where a contract is unambiguous, a party may not create ambiguity or “give the contract a meaning different from that which its language imports”) (internal quotations omitted); *Texas v. Am. Tobacco Co.*, 463 F.3d 399, 407 (5th Cir. 2006) (“Courts interpreting unambiguous contracts are confined to the four corners of the document, and cannot look to extrinsic evidence to create an ambiguity.”).

38. It should go without saying, but CLO Holdco (and the other parties to the Members Agreement) should also be required to satisfy their obligations under the Members Agreement and execute the “Adherence Agreement” as required by Section 6.6 of the Members Agreement in connection with the Transfer of HarbourVest’s interests to HCMLPI or any other permitted Transfer.

39. Finally, and notably, although CLO Holdco spends considerable time arguing that HarbourVest should be required to comply with the ROFO, nowhere in the CLOH Objection does CLO Holdco state that it wishes to purchase HarbourVest’s interests in HCLOF. This omission is telling. CLO Holdco and the other Objectors have no interest in actually exercising their alleged right of first refusal contained in the Members Agreement. Rather, their only interest is in causing the Debtor to spend time and money responding to a legion of related (and coordinated) objections.¹⁸

¹⁸ *See Debtor’s Amended Witness and Exhibit List with Respect to Evidentiary Hearing to be Held on January 8, 2021* [Adv. Pro. 20-3190-sgj, Docket No. 46], Exhibit Q; Exhibit T (email from Mr. Dondero as forwarded to Mr. Ellington stating “Holy bananas..... make sure we object [to the HarbourVest Settlement]”); Exhibit Y.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above and in the Motion, the Debtor respectfully requests that the Court grant the Motion.

Dated: January 13, 2021

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No.143717) (*pro hac vice*)
Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084) (*pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 266326) (*pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992) (*pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (NY Bar No. 5612569)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
Facsimile: (310) 201-0760
E-mail: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
ikharasch@pszjlaw.com
jmorris@pszjlaw.com
gdemo@pszjlaw.com
hwinograd@pszjlaw.com

-and-

HAYWARD PLLC

/s/ Zachery Z. Annable

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for the Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession

EXHIBIT 9

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

In Re:) **Case No. 19-34054-sgj-11**
) Chapter 11
)
HIGHLAND CAPITAL) Dallas, Texas
MANAGEMENT, L.P.,) Thursday, January 14, 2021
) 9:30 a.m. Docket
Debtor.)
) - MOTION TO PREPAY LOAN
) [1590]
) - MOTION TO COMPROMISE
) CONTROVERSY [1625]
) - MOTION TO ALLOW CLAIMS OF
) HARBOURVEST [1207]
)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE STACEY G.C. JERNIGAN,
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE.

WEBEX APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Jeffrey Nathan Pomerantz
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES, LLP
10100 Santa Monica Blvd.,
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4003
(310) 277-6910

For the Debtor: John A. Morris
Gregory V. Demo
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES, LLP
780 Third Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10017-2024
(212) 561-7700

For the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors: Matthew A. Clemente
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP
One South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 853-7539

For CLO Holdco, Ltd.: John J. Kane
KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN LOGAN, P.C.
901 Main Street, Suite 5200
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 777-4261

1 APPEARANCES, cont'd.:

2 For James Dondero: John T. Wilson
3 D. Michael Lynn
4 John Y. Bonds, III
5 Bryan C. Assink
6 BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFFER
7 JONES, LLP
8 420 Throckmorton Street,
9 Suite 1000
10 Fort Worth, TX 76102
11 (817) 405-6900

12 For Get Good Trust and Douglas S. Draper
13 Dugaboy Investment Trust: HELLER, DRAPER & HORN, LLC
14 650 Poydras Street, Suite 2500
15 New Orleans, LA 70130
16 (504) 299-3300

17 For HarbourVest, et al.: Erica S. Weisgerber
18 M. Natasha Labovitz
19 Daniel E. Stroik
20 DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON, LLP
21 919 Third Avenue
22 New York, NY 10022
23 (212) 909-6621

24 For Highland CLO Funding, Rebecca Matsumura
25 Ltd.: KING & SPALDING, LLP
500 West 2nd Street, Suite 1800
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 457-2024

Recorded by: Michael F. Edmond, Sr.
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
1100 Commerce Street, 12th Floor
Dallas, TX 75242
(214) 753-2062

Transcribed by: Kathy Rehling
311 Paradise Cove
Shady Shores, TX 76208
(972) 786-3063

23
24
25 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
transcript produced by transcription service.

1 DALLAS, TEXAS - JANUARY 14, 2021 - 9:41 A.M.

2 THE CLERK: All rise. The United States Bankruptcy
3 Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, is
4 now in session, the Honorable Stacey Jernigan presiding.

5 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. All
6 right. We're a little late getting started because we had
7 lots of reading material for the Court today. All right.
8 This is Judge Jernigan, and we have a couple of Highland
9 settings. The HarbourVest matters are the primary thing we
10 have set today, and then we also have a Debtor's motion
11 pursuant to protocols for authority for Highland Multi-Strat
12 to prepay a loan.

13 All right. Well, let's get a few appearances. First, for
14 the Debtor team, who do we have appearing this morning?

15 MR. POMERANTZ: Good morning, Your Honor. It's Jeff
16 Pomerantz, John Morris, and Greg Demo here on behalf of the
17 Debtor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

19 All right. We have objections on HarbourVest. Who do we
20 have appearing for Mr. Dondero this morning?

21 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, it's John Wilson, and I'm
22 also joined by Michael Lynn, John Bonds, and Bryan Assink.

23 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry. Could -- the court
24 reporter does yeoman's work in this case. Let me just make
25 sure we got all three of those names. Say again, Mr. Wilson.

1 MR. WILSON: John Bonds and Michael Lynn and Bryan
2 Assink.

3 THE COURT: Oh, okay. So, see, I thought I heard
4 somebody Wilson in all of that, which was why I was pressing
5 the issue.

6 All right. Is Mr. Dondero present on the video for
7 today's hearing?

8 MR. WILSON: I believe he is, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Dondero, could you confirm that you
10 are out there? (No response.) Okay. My court reporter says
11 he sees the name out there. Is he in your office?

12 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, he is appearing remotely
13 from my office. I'm not sure exactly where he's appearing
14 from.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. Dondero, if you're out
16 there and you're speaking up to confirm you're present, we're
17 not hearing you. Maybe your device is on mute. So please
18 unmute yourself.

19 (No response.)

20 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take some other
21 appearances and you -- you need to try to communicate with
22 your client and let him know I need to confirm he's present.
23 Okay?

24 All right. Meanwhile, let's go to our other Objectors.
25 CLO Holdco. Who do we have appearing today?

1 MR. KANE: John Kane; Kane Russell Coleman & Logan;
2 on behalf of CLO Holdco.

3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Kane.

4 We had an objection from Dugaboy Investment Trust and Get
5 Good Trust. Who do we have appearing?

6 MR. DRAPER: Douglas Draper, Your Honor, for -- for
7 Draper.

8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Draper.

9 All right. I think those were the only written objections
10 we had. Mr. Pomerantz, do you confirm, we don't have any
11 other objectors for the motions set, correct?

12 MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, there was those three.

13 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't catch your full
14 sentence.

15 MR. POMERANTZ: That is correct, Your Honor. There
16 were three objections to the motion.

17 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Clemente, you're there for the
18 Creditors' Committee?

19 MR. CLEMENTE: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Matt
20 Clemente on behalf of the Official Committee of Unsecured
21 Creditors.

22 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. Thank you.
23 All right. We have a lot of other folks on the video. I'm
24 not going to go ahead and take a roll call of other lawyers.

25 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor?

1 THE COURT: Yes?

2 MS. WEISGERBER: Excuse me, Your Honor. It's Erica
3 Weisgerber from Debevoise on behalf of HarbourVest.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MS. WEISGERBER: And I'm joined by Natasha Labovitz
6 and Dan Stroik --

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MS. WEISGERBER: -- from Debevoise as well.

9 THE COURT: Thank you. I was neglectful in not
10 getting your appearance, because, of course, you're at the
11 front and center of this motion to compromise, and I did see
12 that you filed a reply brief yesterday afternoon. Okay.
13 Thank you.

14 All right. Do we have -- do we have Mr. Dondero on the
15 line? I'm going to check again.

16 (No response.)

17 THE COURT: Mr. Dondero's counsel, I cannot hear you,
18 so please unmute your device.

19 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, it appears to me that Mr.
20 Dondero's device was unmuted as soon as you asked if he was
21 available. I sent him a communication a second ago asking if
22 he's having technical difficulties. I have not received a
23 response, so I --

24 MR. DONDERO: Hello. Can anybody hear me?

25 THE COURT: Oh.

1 MR. WILSON: Okay. I hear him.

2 THE COURT: Mr. Dondero?

3 MR. DONDERO: Hello?

4 THE COURT: Is that you?

5 MR. DONDERO: Yeah, it is. I've been on. I've heard
6 everything since the beginning. It's just we've had technical
7 difficulties. I couldn't use the Highland offices. We've
8 been trying to set up something else.

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 MR. DONDERO: But I'm on now, if -- yes.

11 THE COURT: All right. Very good. Well, I'm glad
12 we've got you.

13 All right. Well, Mr. Pomerantz, how did you want to
14 proceed this morning?

15 MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, we could take up the
16 HarbourVest motion first, and I will turn it over to John
17 Morris. He and Greg Demo will be handling that. And then
18 after that we can handle the other motion, which is unopposed.

19 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morris?

20 MR. KANE: Your Honor, this is -- sorry. This is
21 John Kane for CLO Holdco. Just very briefly, if I may. And
22 this will affect, I think, the Debtor's case in chief, so I'll
23 expedite things a little bit, I believe.

24 CLO Holdco has had an opportunity to review the reply
25 briefing, and after doing so has gone back and scrubbed the

1 HCLOF corporate documents. Based on our analysis of Guernsey
2 law and some of the arguments of counsel in those pleadings
3 and our review of the appropriate documents, I obtained
4 authority from my client, Grant Scott, as Trustee for CLO
5 Holdco, to withdraw the CLO Holdco objection based on the
6 interpretation of the member agreement.

7 THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you for that, Mr.
8 Kane. I think that -- that eliminates one of the major
9 arguments that we had anticipated this morning. So, thank you
10 for that.

11 Any other housekeeping matters that maybe someone had that
12 I didn't ask about?

13 MS. MATSUMURA: Yes, Your Honor. This is Rebecca
14 Matsumura from King & Spalding representing Highland CLO
15 Funding, Ltd. I just wanted to put on the record, we -- our
16 client had requested that some of its organizational documents
17 be filed under seal. But we have given permission for the
18 parties to present the relevant excerpts, to the extent it's
19 still relevant after Mr. Kane's announcement, in court. And
20 we'd just ask that the underlying documents remain sealed, but
21 we're not going to object if they show them on a PowerPoint or
22 anything like that.

23 So, to the extent that you had that on your radar, I just
24 wanted to clear that up for the proceedings.

25 THE COURT: All right. Well, I did sign an order

1 late last night. I don't know if it's popped up on the
2 docket.

3 MS. MATSUMURA: Yes, Your Honor. That's what this
4 referred to. That was what -- these are the documents that
5 were being sealed. And so I just wanted to note, if you --
6 you know, if the Debtor puts up an excerpt of those documents
7 and you're like, wait a minute, didn't I seal those, that we
8 were the party that requested them be under seal and we're
9 fine with them being shown in court, as long as the underlying
10 documents aren't publicly accessible.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Got you. Thank you.

12 All right. Any other housekeeping matters?

13 MR. MORRIS: Yes, Your Honor. This is John Morris
14 from Pachulski Stang for the Debtor. Good morning.

15 THE COURT: Good morning.

16 MR. MORRIS: The only other matter that I wanted to
17 raise, and I can do it now or I can do it later, or Your Honor
18 may tell me that it's not appropriate to do at this time, is
19 to schedule the Debtor's motion to hold Mr. Dondero in
20 contempt for violation of the TRO.

21 THE COURT: All right. Well, let's do that at the
22 conclusion today. And please make sure I do it. I think I
23 was going to address this last Friday, and we went very late
24 and it slipped off my radar screen. But I did see from my
25 courtroom deputy that you all were reaching out to her

1 yesterday to get this set, and then Mr. Dondero's counsel
2 reached out to her and said, We're going to file an objection
3 to a setting next Wednesday, or I think you had asked for a
4 setting next Tuesday or Wednesday.

5 MR. MORRIS: I did.

6 THE COURT: And I don't -- I don't know if that
7 response/objection was ever filed last night. I haven't seen
8 it if it was. So, we'll -- please, make sure I don't forget.
9 We'll take that up at the end of today's matters. All right.
10 Well, --

11 MR. MORRIS: All right. So, --

12 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor, one last housekeeping
13 item from -- I'm joined this morning by Michael Pugatch of
14 HarbourVest, who will present some testimony this morning. I
15 just want to confirm he's on the line and confirm no
16 objections to him sitting in for the rest of the hearing.

17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pugatch, this is Judge
18 Jernigan. Could you respond? Are you there with us?

19 MR. PUGATCH: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Mike
20 Pugatch from HarbourVest here.

21 THE COURT: All right. Very good. I think we had
22 you testify once before in the Acis matter, if I'm not
23 mistaken. Maybe. Maybe not. Maybe I saw a video deposition.
24 I can't remember.

25 All right. So, we're going to let Mr. Pugatch sit in on

1 this. Anyone want to say anything about that? I consider him
2 a party representative, so I don't -- I don't think anyone
3 could invoke the Rule.

4 All right. Very good. Well, let's go forward if there
5 are no more housekeeping matters.

6 MR. MORRIS: Okay.

7 THE COURT: Mr. Morris?

8 MR. MORRIS: Thank you. Thank you very much, Your
9 Honor. John Morris; Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones; for the
10 Debtor.

11 It's a rather straightforward motion today. It's a motion
12 under Rule 9019, pursuant to which the Debtor requests the
13 Court's authority and approval to enter into a settlement
14 agreement with HarbourVest that will resolve a number of
15 claims that HarbourVest has filed against the Debtor.

16 What I -- the way I propose to proceed this morning, Your
17 Honor, is to give what I hope is an informative but relatively
18 brief opening statement. I'll defer to HarbourVest and its
19 counsel as to whether they want to make a presentation in
20 advance of the offer of evidence. Any objecting party, I
21 suppose, should then be given the opportunity to present their
22 case to the Court. Then the Debtor will call Jim Seery, the
23 Debtor's CEO and CRO. We will offer documents into evidence.
24 I would propose then that the objecting parties take the
25 opportunity to ask Mr. Seery any questions they'd like on the

1 matter.

2 After the Debtor rests, I think HarbourVest would like to
3 put Mr. Pugatch on the stand to offer some testimony on their
4 behalf. And I think that that will conclude the case. We can
5 finish up with some closing arguments as to what we believe
6 the evidence showed, but that's the way that I'd like to
7 proceed, if that's okay with the Court.

8 THE COURT: All right. That sounds fine.

9 OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEBTOR

10 MR. MORRIS: Okay. So, as I said, Your Honor, this
11 is a -- this should be a very straightforward motion under
12 Rule 9019. The standard is well-known to the Court. There
13 are four elements to a 9019 motion. The Debtor clearly has
14 the burden of proof on each one. And we easily meet that
15 burden, Your Honor.

16 The standard, just to be clear, the first part is that we
17 have to establish a probability of success, with due
18 consideration for uncertainty of law and fact. The second one
19 is the complexity, likely duration, expense and inconvenience
20 of the litigation. The third part of the test is the
21 paramount interest of creditors. And the fourth part of the
22 test is whether or not the proposed settlement was reached
23 after arm's-length negotiations.

24 The Debtor believes that it easily meets this standard,
25 and frankly, is a little bit frustrated that it's being forced

1 to incur the expense by Mr. Dondero in going through this
2 process.

3 A plain reading, a fair reading of the economics here
4 relative to the claim shows that this is a very reasonable
5 settlement. I don't need to go beyond that, Your Honor. I
6 don't even need to use the word reasonable. It surely meets
7 the lowest standard.

8 We've prepared a couple of demonstrative exhibits, Your
9 Honor. I'm going to use them with Mr. Seery. But I'd like to
10 just put one up on the screen now, if I may.

11 Ms. Canty, can you please put up Demonstrative Exhibit #3?

12 Demonstrative Exhibit #3 is an outline of the economics of
13 the settlement. It includes the various pieces, the
14 components that the parties have agreed to. And it shows, at
15 least from the Debtor's perspective, just what HarbourVest is
16 being given here.

17 Up on the screen is a demonstrative exhibit. It has
18 citations to the evidence that will be admitted by the Court.
19 The first line shows that HarbourVest will receive a \$45
20 million allowed general unsecured nonpriority claim. And that
21 -- that can be found at Debtor's Exhibit EE, Exhibit 1, at
22 Page 2.

23 That claim is discounted by the expected recovery that
24 general unsecured creditors are supposed to get. As of
25 November, in the liquidation analysis that was part of the

1 disclosure statement -- that's the citation in the footnote --
2 the Debtor believed that unsecured creditors were estimated to
3 recover approximately eighty-seven and a half cents on the
4 dollar. And so we just did the arithmetic there to get to the
5 net economic value of the proposed general unsecured claim.

6 And from that, we reduced \$22-1/2 million because that is
7 the net asset value of HarbourVest's interest in HCLOF, which,
8 pursuant to the settlement agreement, it will transfer back to
9 the Debtor, so that the net economic value is approximately
10 \$16.8 million.

11 You will hear testimony from Mr. Seery that this number
12 is, in fact, overstated, and it's overstated because, since
13 the time the disclosure statement was filed in November, a
14 number of events have occurred that will -- that have caused
15 the estimated recovery percentage to be reduced from
16 approximately 87-1/2 percent to something lower than that. We
17 don't have the exact number, Your Honor, but Mr. Seery will --
18 and the evidence will show that there's been more expenses,
19 that there's been some resolution of certain claims. There's
20 been some positive issues, too. But that number is probably
21 in the 70s somewhere.

22 And in any event, I think the point here is, Your Honor,
23 HarbourVest invested \$80 million in HCLOF, which was going to
24 participate in the investment in CLOs. They filed a claim for
25 \$300 million, through treble damages and other claims. But

1 the net economic impact of this is going to be somewhere
2 probably in between \$12 and \$14 million. I'll let Mr. Seery
3 give more precision to that. And it represents less than -- a
4 less than five percent recovery on the total claim.

5 And we think it's important for the Court to keep that in
6 mind. What are the economics here? Are we overpaying? Is
7 this an unreasonable settlement? And I think the evidence
8 will show that the Debtor is not, but that this settlement
9 that you see before you was the product of arm's length, and
10 I'm going to go in reverse order of the four-part test under
11 9019.

12 So, the last part is whether or not the settlement, the
13 proposed settlement was the product of arm's-length
14 negotiation. You'll hear lots of evidence that this
15 settlement that's up on the screen right now very much was the
16 product of arm's-length negotiation.

17 The third part of the test, Your Honor, is whether it
18 meets the paramount interest of creditors. You know,
19 regrettably, Mr. Dondero is the only purported creditor who is
20 objecting here. He may have done so through different
21 vehicles, but every objecting party here is a debtor [sic]
22 owned and controlled by Mr. Dondero. No other creditor -- not
23 the Creditors' Committee, UBS, Acis, Mr. Terry, Mr. Daugherty
24 -- nobody is objecting to this settlement except for Mr.
25 Dondero. And we believe that that highlights the Debtor's

1 ability to meet the third prong of the test, and that is these
2 are -- this settlement is in the paramount interest of
3 creditors.

4 Again, going in reverse, the second part of the test is
5 the complexity, duration, and expense of litigation. There
6 will be no disputed evidence that we meet -- the Debtor easily
7 meets this prong of the test. The evidence is going to show
8 that HarbourVest's claim is based on fraud, fraud in the
9 inducement, fraudulent statements and omissions, the kind of
10 case, Your Honor, that I'm sure you're familiar with that is
11 incredibly fact-intensive, that will be incredibly difficult
12 to navigate through. It will be prolonged, it will be
13 expensive, because you're necessarily relying on he said/she
14 said, basically. And so we're going to have to get testimony
15 from every person that spoke in connection with the events
16 leading up to the transaction. So we think the second prong
17 will be easily met, Your Honor.

18 And then the last prong -- the first prong, if you will --
19 is the likelihood of success on the merits. We think that the
20 settlement, the economic recovery that's up on the screen
21 here, which ultimately will be less than five percent of the
22 claimed amount, in and of itself shows that the settlement is
23 consistent with the Debtor's perception of its likely success
24 on the merits. I'm certain that HarbourVest disagrees, but
25 that's okay, we're here today and that's the Debtor's view,

1 and the Court is here to assess the Debtor's business judgment
2 and whether the Debtor has properly analyzed the issues and
3 gone through the process. And the evidence will show
4 conclusively that it will. That it has.

5 Mr. Seery will testify at some length as to the risks that
6 he saw. I think that you'll hear counsel for Mr. Dondero ask
7 both Mr. Seery and Mr. Pugatch a number of questions designed
8 to elicit testimony about this defense or that defense. And
9 it's a little -- it's a little ironic, Your Honor, because,
10 really, every defense that they're going to try to suggest to
11 the Court was a valid defense is a defense that the Debtor
12 considered. In fact, it's, you know, it's a little spooky,
13 how they've -- how they've been able to identify kind of the
14 arguments that the Debtor had already considered in the
15 prosecution of their objections here.

16 But be that as it may, the evidence will conclusively show
17 that the Debtor acted consistent with its fiduciary duties,
18 acted in the best interests of the Debtor's estate, acted
19 completely appropriately here in getting yet another very
20 solid achievement for the Debtor, leaving very few claims that
21 are disputed at this point, all but one of which I believe are
22 in the hands of Mr. Dondero.

23 So, that's what we think that the evidence will show.

24 I do want to express my appreciation to Mr. Kane for
25 reflecting on the arguments that we made with respect to the

1 ability of the Debtor to engage in the transfer or the
2 acquisition of the asset from HarbourVest. I would -- I would
3 respectfully request that we just enter into a short
4 stipulation on the record reflecting that the Debtor's
5 acquisition of HarbourVest's interests in HCLOF is compliant
6 with all of the applicable agreements between the parties.

7 And with that, Your Honor, I look forward to putting Mr.
8 Seery on the stand and presenting the Debtor's case.

9 THE COURT: All right. Other opening statements?

10 OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF CLO HOLDCO, LTD.

11 MR. KANE: Yes, Your Honor. Sorry. John Kane on
12 behalf of CLO Holdco.

13 In response to Mr. Morris, I'm not going to enter into a
14 stipulation on behalf of my client, but the Debtor is
15 compliant with all aspects of the contract. We withdrew our
16 objection, and we believe that's sufficient.

17 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm content with that.
18 Other opening statements?

19 OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF HARBOURVEST

20 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor, Erica Weisgerber on
21 behalf of HarbourVest.

22 HarbourVest joins in Mr. Morris's comments in support of
23 the settlement, and we believe that the question of whether
24 the settlement between HarbourVest and the Debtor satisfies
25 the Rule 9019 standard is not even a close one.

1 Some Objectors have made arguments about the merits of
2 HarbourVest's claims, which is why we're here. As Your Honor
3 will hear this morning, HarbourVest has meaningful and
4 meritorious claims against Highland, but made the business
5 decision to avoid the time, expense, and inherent risk of
6 litigation in the interest of preserving value, both for
7 itself and for the estate.

8 Today, Michael Pugatch, a managing director of
9 HarbourVest, will testify before the Court. He'll explain
10 that HarbourVest claims against Highland arise out of certain
11 misrepresentations and omissions by Highland to HarbourVest in
12 connection with HarbourVest's purchase of an interest in
13 HCLOF, one of Highland's managed funds. Those
14 misrepresentations and omissions, as Your Honor will hear,
15 relate to Highland's litigation with its former employee,
16 Joshua Terry, and transfers that were conducted in 2017 to
17 strip Acis of value and prevent Mr. Terry from collecting on
18 an \$8 million judgment.

19 Mr. Pugatch will further explain that HarbourVest would
20 not have invested in HCLOF had it known the underlying facts
21 about those Acis transfers.

22 Mr. Pugatch will also testify that not only did
23 HarbourVest not know about those transfers, it learned about
24 those transfers when it was accused of orchestrating the
25 transfers itself in the Acis bankruptcy. Your Honor will hear

1 that the Acis trustee sought extensive discovery from
2 HarbourVest after numerous accusations that HarbourVest was
3 behind the transfers.

4 Mr. Pugatch will also testify that Highland charged legal
5 fees for itself and its affiliates to HCLOF, essentially
6 forcing HCLOF to fund the litigation involving the Acis
7 bankruptcy and Mr. Terry.

8 In total, HarbourVest's claims for damages are over a
9 hundred million dollars in investment-related losses, lost
10 profits, legal fees inappropriately charged to HCLOF, its own
11 legal fees. And that's before interest or trebling damages.

12 But HarbourVest stands ready to litigate its claims, but
13 following hard-fought and extensive negotiations with the
14 Debtors, the parties reached the settlement that's now before
15 the Court. Mr. Pugatch's testimony regarding the strong
16 factual bases for HarbourVest's claims against Highland and
17 its recoverable damages will further underscore the risks that
18 the Debtors faced if they chose to litigate these claims, and
19 why this settlement is fair, equitable, and in the best
20 interest of the estate.

21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Counsel.

22 Other opening statements?

23 OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF GET GOOD AND DUGABOY TRUSTS

24 MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, this is Douglas Draper on
25 behalf of one of the Objectors. I'd like to just make a few

1 comments with respect to what I've heard and what the Court is
2 going to hear.

3 The first issue I'd like to address is the comment by
4 counsel for the Debtor that no other party has objected. The
5 9019 motion is one of the issues that this Court has to rule
6 on, whether or not there was an objection or not. So the fact
7 that this may be -- bankruptcy is not a popularity contest and
8 not an issue of who votes for what and doesn't vote. This,
9 along with the 1129(a) tests, are clearly within your
10 province, and you need to listen carefully because you'll have
11 to make your own independent analysis whether my objection is
12 correct or incorrect.

13 Two other points I'd like to make that I think are very
14 salient. Number one is, if you look at the Debtor's
15 disclosure statement, it basically took the position that the
16 HarbourVest claim is of little or no value. And lo and
17 behold, thirty days later, there's a settlement that brings
18 about a significant recovery to HarbourVest. The timing is
19 interesting, and I think the Court needs to pay careful
20 attention to what transpired between the two dates.

21 And then the last point I'd like to make is, as you listen
22 to the evidence, and what I learned abundantly clear from
23 hearing the depositions, is that the claim of HarbourVest, if
24 there is a claim at all, is probably one hundred percent --
25 should be subordinated in that it appears to arise out of the

1 purchase or sale of a security. And, again, I would ask the
2 Court to listen carefully to this because that's what it
3 appears to be and that's what the evidence is going to show to
4 the Court.

5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Draper, let me clarify
6 something I'm not sure if I heard you say or not. Were you
7 saying that the Court still needs to drill down on the issue
8 of whether the Debtor can acquire HarbourVest's interest in
9 HCLOF?

10 MR. DRAPER: No.

11 THE COURT: Okay. I was confused whether you were
12 saying I needed to take an independent look at that, now that
13 the objection has been withdrawn of Holdco. You are not
14 pressing that issue?

15 MR. DRAPER: No, I am not. Basically, I think it's
16 the fairness of the settlement. I think the transferability
17 of the interest is separate and apart from the fairness of the
18 settlement itself. I think the fairness -- the
19 transferability was a contractual issue between two parties
20 that the Court does not have to drill down on.

21 THE COURT: All right. I have another question for
22 you. I want to clarify your client's standing. Tell me --
23 I'm looking through a chart I printed out a while back. I
24 guess Dugaboy Investment Trust filed a couple of proofs of
25 claim; is that right?

1 MR. DRAPER: Yes.

2 THE COURT: Okay. What --

3 MR. DRAPER: And objections are pending.

4 THE COURT: Pardon?

5 MR. DRAPER: Objections to those claims are pending
6 before the Court, Your Honor, --

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. DRAPER: -- and have not been litigated.

9 THE COURT: And what about Get Good Trust?

10 MR. DRAPER: Get Good Trust has a proof of claim also
11 that objections are pending to. Pending.

12 THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to get too
13 sidetracked here, but I know standing was -- was mentioned as
14 a legal argument today. What is the basis for those proofs of
15 claim?

16 MR. DRAPER: The first one is, with respect to the
17 proof of claim for Dugaboy, there is an investment that
18 Dugaboy made that was then funneled, we believe, up to the
19 Debtor. And the -- the loan that exists, we believe is a
20 Debtor loan, as opposed to a loan to the entity that we made
21 the loans to.

22 And, again, it's a matter that the Court is going to hear.
23 The claim may or may not be allowed. It has not been
24 disallowed yet.

25 The second part to the Dugaboy ownership is we own an

1 interest in the Debtor. And so we are, in fact, a party in
2 interest.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. DRAPER: It may be a small interest, but it is an
5 interest.

6 THE COURT: It has a limited partnership interest in
7 the Debtor?

8 MR. DRAPER: Yes.

9 THE COURT: Is that correct?

10 MR. DRAPER: Yes.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll move forward. Thank
12 you.

13 Does that cover -- any other opening statements? I think
14 that covered everyone who was -- who filed some sort of
15 pleading today. No.

16 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, John Wilson on behalf of --

17 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

18 MR. WILSON: -- Mr. Dondero.

19 THE COURT: I missed Mr. Dondero's counsel. I knew
20 we had visited at some point this morning. I just got
21 confused there. Go ahead, Mr. Wilson.

22 MR. WILSON: No problem, Your Honor. I was just
23 going to say that we will reserve our comments until after the
24 conclusion of the testimony.

25 THE COURT: All right. Very well.

1 Mr. Morris, you may call your first witness.

2 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I do,
3 just two very, very quick points.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. MORRIS: To be clear, Dugaboy's interest in the
6 Debtor is 0.1866 percent. Less than two-tenths of one
7 percent.

8 Secondly, the argument that Mr. Draper just made with
9 respect to subordination is one that appears in nobody's
10 papers. And, in fact, not only doesn't it appear in anybody's
11 papers, but Mr. Dondero, I believe, specifically took issue
12 with the fact that a portion of the consideration that
13 HarbourVest would receive would be on a subordinated basis,
14 and he would -- and I think he took the position there is no
15 basis to give them a subordinated claim.

16 So, I just wanted to point those items out to the Court,
17 not that I think either one makes a large difference today,
18 but I do want to deal with the facts.

19 THE COURT: Thank you.

20 MR. MORRIS: The Debtor would call -- you're welcome,
21 Your Honor. The Debtor calls Mr. James Seery.

22 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Seery, welcome back to
23 virtual court. If you could say, "Testing, one, two" so I can
24 see you and swear you in.

25 MR. SEERY: Testing, one, two.

Seery - Direct

26

1 THE COURT: All right. I heard you but I'm not yet
2 seeing your video. Is your video turned on?

3 MR. SEERY: Video is on. Yes, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I see you now. Please raise your
5 right hand.

6 JAMES SEERY, DEBTOR'S WITNESS, SWORN

7 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Morris?

8 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. MORRIS:

11 Q Good morning, Mr. Seery. Can you hear me?

12 A I can. Thank you, Mr. Morris.

13 Q Okay. Let's just cut to the chase here. Are you familiar
14 with HarbourVest's claims filed against the Debtor?

15 A I am, yes.

16 Q And did you personally review them?

17 A I did, yes.

18 Q Do you recall that over the summer the Debtor objected to
19 HarbourVest's claim?

20 A Yes, we did.

21 Q Why -- can you explain to the judge why Harbour -- why the
22 Debtor objected to HarbourVest's claim last summer?

23 A Sure. The HarbourVest claims, I believe there are about
24 six of them, initially were filed, and they were -- they were
25 relatively vague in terms of what the specifics of the claims

1 were.

2 So, we saw the claims but didn't, frankly, pay a lot of
3 attention to the underlying transaction that was referred to
4 in the proofs of claim and the losses that HarbourVest had
5 claimed to suffer -- to suffer with respect to their purchase
6 of securities related to HCLOF and the damages caused by the
7 Acis case. So we filed a pretty pro forma objection. I
8 believe it was a simply stated objection that we didn't have
9 any record that there was anything in the Debtor's books and
10 records that they had a valid claim for any amount against the
11 Debtor.

12 Q Are you aware that HarbourVest subsequently filed a
13 response to the Debtor's objection to their claims?

14 A Yes. Yes, I am aware.

15 Q And did you familiarize yourself with that particular
16 response?

17 A I did indeed. It was a pretty extensive response, really
18 developing the full panoply of their claims, which included
19 claims for expenses relating to the Acis case, which
20 HarbourVest viewed as being improperly charged to HCLOF by its
21 manager, which is effectively Highland. Those expenses,
22 HarbourVest took the view, were excessive, had nothing to do
23 with the investment, and were simply a pursuit of a personal
24 vendetta against Mr. Terry and his interests by Mr. Dondero,
25 and using HCLOF's money to actually pursue those interests.

Seery - Direct

28

1 In addition, and this was the first time we saw that,
2 HarbourVest brought forth its claims that it was entitled to
3 effectively rescind the transaction. And I say rescind the
4 transaction: In security parlance, they claim that they were
5 induced by fraud, I think as most are -- to enter into the
6 transaction.

7 As most are aware, the liability limitations in the OMs
8 and the exculpation in the documents are pretty broad, and
9 HarbourVest's position was that they weren't going to be
10 subject to those limitations because the actual transaction
11 that they entered into was a fraud on them, designed by Mr.
12 Dondero, Mr. Ellington, and the Highland team.

13 Q All right. Let's talk about your understanding, the
14 Debtor's understanding of the factual background to
15 HarbourVest's claim. What is your understanding of the
16 investment that HarbourVest made?

17 A Well, HarbourVest made an investment in the Highland CLO
18 business. The Highland CLO business was -- was Acis. And
19 effectively, the business had been separated, but in name
20 only. Acis was just a shell, with a few partners --
21 obviously, Mr. Terry as well -- but it was all Highland
22 personnel doing all the work.

23 And what they were trying to do with Acis was, in essence,
24 resuscitate a business that had been in a bit of a decline
25 from its pre-crisis heyday.

Seery - Direct

29

1 They were looking to take additional outside capital.

2 They would -- they would pay down or take money out of the
3 transaction, Highland would, or ultimately Mr. Dondero, and
4 they would -- they would seek to invest in Acis CLOs,
5 Highland's 1.0 CLOs. And then with respect to the Acis CLOs,
6 and potentially new CLOs, but with the Acis CLOs, they'd seek
7 to reset those and capture what they thought would be an
8 opportunity in the market to -- to really use the assets that
9 were there, not have to gather assets in the warehouse but be
10 able to use those assets to reset them to market prices for
11 the liabilities and then make money on the equity.

12 Q Do you have an understanding --

13 A Then --

14 Q I'm sorry. Go ahead.

15 A Why don't I continue? So, the transaction, they found
16 HarbourVest as a potential investor, and the basis of the
17 transaction was that they would make an investment into Acis.

18 Shortly before the transaction, and while they were doing
19 diligence, Mr. Terry received his arbitration award. I
20 believe that was in October of 2017. The transaction with
21 HarbourVest closed in mid- to late November of 2017. But Mr.
22 Terry was not an integral part. Indeed, he wasn't going to be
23 a key man. He had been long gone from Highland by that time.

24 What the -- I think you asked me originally what the basis
25 of their claim was. The transaction went forward, and the

Seery - Direct

30

1 basis of their claim is that they really were never -- nothing
2 was disclosed to them about the nature of the dispute with Mr.
3 Terry other than in the highest-level terms; the animosity
4 with respect to which that dispute was held by Highland and
5 potentially Mr. Terry; and really, how those costs would be
6 borne and risks be borne by the investment that they were
7 making.

8 That was, in essence, the transaction and the high-level
9 view of their claim.

10 Q Okay. Just a few very specific facts. Do you have an
11 understanding as to how much HarbourVest invested and what
12 they got in exchange for that investment?

13 A Yeah. HarbourVest invested in a couple tranches, and I
14 forget the exact dates, but approximately \$75 million
15 originally, and then they added another five. Some
16 distributions were made in the first half of 2018, putting
17 their net investment in the mid-seventies on the investment,
18 which now is worth about 22-1/2 million bucks.

19 Q And what percentage interest in HCLOF did HarbourVest
20 acquire, to the best of your knowledge?

21 A They have 49.98 percent of HCLOF. HCLOF, just to refresh
22 -- the Court is, I think, well aware of this, but to refresh,
23 is a Guernsey entity. Not -- not atypical for structures of
24 this type to use offshore jurisdictions and sell the
25 securities under -- at least to U.S. -- can't sell them to

Seery - Direct

31

1 U.S. investors unless they qualify, and these are sold under
2 Reg S to -- to investors that otherwise qualify. And
3 HarbourVest was investing in that transaction through the
4 Guernsey structure.

5 Q And do you have an understanding as to who owned the 50-
6 plus percent of HCLOF that HarbourVest was not going to
7 acquire?

8 A Yeah. There's -- you can tell by the name. HCLOF is
9 Highland CLO Funding. This is a Highland vehicle. So
10 Highland owned and controlled the vehicle. The DAF, which is
11 -- which is Dondero-controlled trusts, have the -- 49 percent.
12 Highland has, I believe, around .63-65 percent directly. And
13 then Highland employees at the time who were involved in the
14 business owned another small percentage.

15 So the majority was going to be controlled by Highland
16 through its control of DAF and its control of the employees
17 that worked for it. HarbourVest would be a minority investor.

18 Q Okay. And I believe you testified that the investment was
19 made in mid-November; is that right?

20 A That's correct. I think it was the 15th, may have been
21 the 17th of November.

22 Q And do you recall when in October the Terry arbitration
23 award was rendered?

24 A It was about a month before. I think it was right around
25 the 20th, the 17th to the 20th. I may be slightly wrong on

Seery - Direct

32

1 each of those dates.

2 Q Okay. What is your understanding as to what happened
3 after the issuance of the award that is the basis or at least
4 one of the bases for HarbourVest's claim?

5 A I don't think there's -- I don't think there's any
6 dispute. And there certainly are judicial findings. Dondero
7 and Highland went about stripping Acis of all of its assets.
8 So, remember that Acis is not a separate standalone company,
9 in any event. It's controlled and dominated completely by
10 Highland at the time. But it did have contracts. And those
11 contracts had value.

12 So the first idea was to strip out the management contract
13 and put it into a separate vehicle, which we called HCF
14 Advisor, which Highland still owns. The second piece was to
15 strip out some valuable assets, the risk retention piece,
16 which was a loan that in essence was equity that Highland had
17 put into Acis but structured as a loan, as many of the
18 transactions we'll see down the road are, in order to deal
19 with some -- avoid taxes in any way possible. And that
20 structure, that value moved value out of Acis for the express
21 purpose of trying to run, in essence, the Highland business
22 back in Highland.

23 Remember, as I said, Acis is just a Highland business
24 moved to a separate shell. When Mr. Terry got his arbitration
25 award against Acis and was seeking to enforce it, it was

Seery - Direct

33

1 pretty straightforward, let's take all the assets -- Dondero
2 scheme -- let's take all the assets and move them back into
3 Highland so Terry can't get anything.

4 Q And how does that scheme relate to the HarbourVest claim,
5 to the best of your knowledge?

6 A Well, HarbourVest -- HarbourVest's position is that they
7 invested in Acis and -- and whether Acis was called Acis or
8 called Highland, it doesn't really matter; there were valuable
9 assets in the -- in the entity that they were going to be
10 investing in through the equity in these CLOs and some of the
11 debt securities in those CLOs.

12 And then the stripping out and the fraudulent conveyances
13 out of Acis caused them damages because that's what left the
14 damage to Mr. Terry.

15 The quick math on Acis, by the way, is Acis has probably
16 lost, total damages, 175 million bucks. And that's pretty
17 easy. DAF lost 50. HarbourVest lost 50. Fifteen million of
18 fees charged to HCLOF. Another five million of fees, at
19 least, incurred by Mr. Terry. Ten million that went to Mr.
20 Terry, 15 to Highland fees, another five, plus Mr. Terry's
21 settlement in this case, over eight million bucks.

22 So HarbourVest's position, which, on a factual basis, you
23 know, is problematic for the estate, is, wait a second, we
24 invested in this vehicle with Highland. That was supposed to
25 invest in Highland CLOs. They were called Acis, but they were

Seery - Direct

34

1 Highland CLOs. And then you went about causing tremendous
2 damage to that vehicle that we ultimately were investing in,
3 and then charge us for the pleasure.

4 Q You used the phrase earlier "OM," I believe.

5 A Offering memorandum.

6 Q Offering memorandum? Can you just explain to the Court
7 your understanding of what an offering memorandum is?

8 A Typically, under U.S. law, and foreign jurisdictions have
9 similar laws, you have to have a document that explains the
10 securities that you're selling. And it goes into extreme
11 detail about the securities and the risks related to those
12 securities.

13 And the idea is not to have a document that tells you
14 whether it's a good investment or a bad investment, but it's a
15 document that discloses to the potential investor all of the
16 risks with respect to that security or related to the
17 investment over the duration of the security. It doesn't
18 predict the future, but it's supposed to make sure that it
19 gives you a very clean view of the past and a very clean view
20 of what the facts from the past are and how they would
21 implicate the future of the investment.

22 Q And in the course of its diligence, did the Debtor have an
23 opportunity to review the offering memorandum in the context
24 of the claims that were being asserted by HarbourVest?

25 A Oh, absolutely. It was originally effectively -- it's an

Seery - Direct

35

1 HCLOF offering memorandum. But as I said, HCLOF was managed
2 and controlled by Highland, and Highland originally prepared
3 it. And then, of course, in connection with -- with this
4 dispute and these claims, we reviewed it, both myself and my
5 legal team.

6 Q All right.

7 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, the offering memorandum is
8 on the Debtor's exhibit list, and I think this is an
9 appropriate time to move into evidence Debtor's Exhibits A
10 through EE, all of which appear at Docket No. 1732.

11 THE COURT: 1732?

12 MR. MORRIS: It's the Debtor's Second Amended Witness
13 and Exhibit List.

14 THE COURT: All right. Any objection to admission of
15 A through EE?

16 MR. DRAPER: Douglas Draper. No objection, Your
17 Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right. Mr. --

19 MR. MORRIS: May I proceed?

20 THE COURT: Yeah. Mr. Wilson, did you want to
21 confirm no objection?

22 (Echoing.)

23 THE COURT: All right. Hearing no objection,
24 Debtor's A through EE are admitted.

25 (Debtor's Exhibits A through EE are received into

Seery - Direct

36

1 evidence.)

2 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Morris.

3 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. The offering
4 memorandum itself is one of the documents that we filed under
5 seal, and we did so at the request of counsel to HCLOF. But
6 HCLOF has consented to our sharing up on the screen certain
7 very limited provisions of the document, without waiving the
8 request that the agreement otherwise be maintained under seal.

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 MR. MORRIS: So may I proceed on that basis, Your
11 Honor?

12 THE COURT: You may. Uh-huh.

13 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Ms. Canty, can you please put up
14 on the screen Demonstrative Exhibit #1? Okay. Can we just --
15 is there a way to just expand that just a bit, Ms. Canty?
16 Thank you very much. And if we could just scroll it up?
17 Thank you very much. Perfect.

18 Okay. So, Your Honor, this, as the footnote says, is an
19 excerpt from the offering memorandum that can be found at
20 Debtor's Exhibit AA. Double A. And this particular portion
21 of the offering memorandum is at Page 35.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 BY MR. MORRIS:

24 Q Mr. Seery, have you seen this portion of the offering
25 memorandum before?

Seery - Direct

37

1 A Yes, I have. But before I continue, I just -- I should
2 have checked. Are you able to hear me clearly? Am I speaking
3 too quickly or am I cutting out? I just want to make sure.
4 I'm using a different set of audio today.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 MR. MORRIS: That's fine.

7 THE COURT: I hear you very well.

8 MR. MORRIS: Yeah.

9 THE COURT: So I think we're good right now. Thank
10 you.

11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. I was
12 just checking.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 THE WITNESS: In response to your question, Mr.
15 Morris, yes, I have seen this before.

16 BY MR. MORRIS:

17 Q Okay. And can you -- did you form a view in doing the due
18 diligence as to the adequacy of this disclosure?

19 A Yes, I did.

20 Q Can you share your -- or share with Judge Jernigan the
21 Debtor's view as to the adequacy of this disclosure concerning
22 the litigation between Highland and Acis?

23 A With respect to the litigation between Highland and Acis,
24 or, really, between Acis, Highland, and Highland's principals
25 and Acis's principal, totally inadequate. The disclosure here

Seery - Direct

38

1 is very high-level. And if there were no other litigation
2 going on, it might serve to suffice. It basically says, In
3 our business, because we invest in distressed loans, there's a
4 lot of litigation around distressed investments, and that's
5 what we have. And then it says, We've talked with the
6 investor about other things and we're -- we think that's
7 enough.

8 Q Is there anything in this portion or anywhere in the
9 offering memorandum that you're aware of that disclosed to
10 HarbourVest that in the weeks leading up to the investment
11 Highland was engaged in the fraudulent transfer of assets away
12 from Acis?

13 A No. And I apologize, because I think it's -- I've
14 conflated two provisions. This one only deals with the very
15 high-level nature of the business. It doesn't give any
16 indication that there's any material litigation going on
17 elsewhere with respect to Acis.

18 I believe there's another provision that says, We -- we
19 have talked to -- oh, here -- I'm sorry. It is here.
20 Shareholders have had an opportunity to discuss with Highland
21 to their satisfaction all litigation matters against Highland
22 and its affiliates unrelated to its distressed business.

23 That, in my opinion, is wholly inadequate.

24 Q Okay.

25 MR. MORRIS: And let's put up -- actually, let's just

Seery - Direct

39

1 move on.

2 BY MR. MORRIS:

3 Q Let's go to the settlement itself.

4 MR. MORRIS: Can we put back up Demonstrative Exhibit
5 #3?

6 BY MR. MORRIS:

7 Q Mr. Seery, can you see that?

8 A Yes, I can.

9 Q Does this generally describe the net economic recovery of
10 the HarbourVest settlement based on estimated recoveries for
11 general unsecured creditors as of November 2020?

12 A As of November 2020, it does. And you alluded to this in
13 your opening, but to be clear, the numbers have shifted.
14 Costs have increased. The -- so the -- effectively, the
15 numerator, in terms of distributable value that we estimate,
16 is lower. And settlements, the denominator, have also
17 increased. So the claims against the estate that have been
18 recognized have increased. And that, that probably takes it
19 down closer, in our view, to about seventy cents distribution,
20 a number closer to nine to ten million, maybe a little bit
21 less.

22 However, there's also some additional value that we -- we
23 believe we will recover directly. There are north of \$150
24 million of intercompany notes owed by Dondero entities to
25 Highland. A number of those notes are demand notes, and we've

Seery - Direct

40

1 already made demand. We'll be initiating actions next week.
2 So those are -- those value, we believe, we'll recover
3 directly from Mr. Dondero and from related entities.

4 To the extent those related entities don't have value, we
5 feel very strongly about our ability to pierce the veil and
6 reach in to Mr. Dondero. And then his assets, either his
7 personal assets or the assets that he claims are in trusts.

8 In addition, there are a significant amount of notes that
9 were extended in two -- I believe around 2017, for no
10 consideration. Those notes were demand notes, I believe, and
11 then extended it 30 years. So they have 2047 maturities.
12 Those were probably going to have to be subject to fraudulent
13 conveyance type actions or -- or some sort of sale at a very
14 discounted value because third parties wouldn't want long-
15 dated notes with Mr. Dondero as the counterparty for very much
16 money.

17 Those -- they defaulted on some of those parties, so we
18 effectively turned them into demand notes. We've accelerated,
19 and we'll be bringing actions against those entities next week
20 as well.

21 So I think (garbled) have come up, so I apologize. One
22 way of saying I think the sixteen and a half is a bit high
23 right now, based upon what we know, but the value is going to
24 be higher than our estimate a couple of weeks ago because we
25 do believe we'll be able to recover on the notes.

Seery - Direct

41

1 One additional caveat, just to be fully transparent here.
2 This summary with the 16.8 doesn't include the subordinated
3 piece of this -- of this claim and our resolution. That --
4 recovery of that piece will be dependent upon the success of
5 litigations.

6 In order for the subordinated piece to get paid, all
7 general unsecured claims in Class -- Classes 7 and 8 will have
8 to be paid in full. And then -- and then the subordinated
9 class in Class 9, which we believe UBS will have a piece of,
10 and HarbourVest will have a piece of by this settlement, those
11 will be able to recover, and those will be based upon other
12 claims of action against -- primarily against related parties.

13 Q And then that last point, is that what's reflected in
14 Footnote 3 on this page?

15 A That's correct, yes.

16 Q Okay. And just for the record, there's a reduction in
17 value of \$22-1/2 million. Do you see that?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And can you just explain to the Court what that is and how
20 that value was arrived at?

21 A Yes. I may be getting slightly ahead of you, Mr. Morris.
22 But to give the Court a reflection of the transaction -- and
23 we can go into the details in a moment -- ultimately, the
24 transaction we structured we think is very fair both
25 economically to the Debtor, but there -- there is some

Seery - Direct

42

1 complexity to it to satisfy some of HarbourVest's concerns
2 that they be able to effectively rescind the transaction, at
3 least from an optical perspective. Value was important, but
4 optics were as well. The twenty-two and a half is the current
5 -- actually, the November value of HCL -- the HarbourVest
6 interests in HCLOF. And that's based upon Highland's
7 evaluation of those interests.

8 So we do believe that that is a fair value as of that
9 date. It has not gone down. It hasn't gone up explosively,
10 either, but it hasn't gone down. We think that's good, real
11 value. That value is in the Acis CLOs, the equity in those
12 CLOs, which is 2 through 6, that we -- we will be working with
13 the HCLOF folks to get Mr. Terry to monetize those assets and
14 those longer-dated CLOs.

15 In addition, I think it's 85 percent of the equity in Acis
16 7 -- Acis 7 is managed by Highland -- that is also beyond its
17 reinvestment period. And in talking to the directors -- and
18 they're new directors, and I'll get to that in a minute, for
19 HCLOF -- they'll seek to push Highland, which is the
20 reorganized Highland, to monetize that asset, with due regard
21 to fair value.

22 In addition, Harbour -- HCLOF owned a significant amount
23 of the preferred or equity pieces, if you will, in the
24 Highland CLO, 1.0 CLOs. As we've talked about, those are not
25 really CLOs. Those are effectively closed-end funds with

Seery - Direct

43

1 illiquid assets, primarily illiquid assets in them. We've had
2 some dispute in front of the Court about selling the liquid
3 assets in them, which we can go into it another time. Those
4 are being liquidated in the market at fair value.

5 But HCLOF also is a significant holder of those preferred
6 shares, and those directors would -- have indicated to me that
7 they would like to see those interests also monetized.

8 Q All right. Let's shift gears for a moment to talk about
9 the diligence that the Debtor did before entering into this
10 agreement. Can you just describe for the Court generally the
11 diligence that was undertaken at your direction?

12 A Well, when we first received the reply to our objection,
13 we dug into that reply and the specifics in it very
14 aggressively. So we reviewed all of the underlying documents
15 related to the original transaction. We discussed with
16 counsel the legal basis for the HarbourVest claims. We
17 interviewed our own HCMLP employees who were involved in the
18 transaction and tested their recollection, specifically around
19 who dealt with HarbourVest, who had the discussions with
20 HarbourVest, what was disclosed to HarbourVest with respect to
21 the Terry dispute and the Acis litigation.

22 We also had done, as I think the Court is well aware from
23 prior 9019 testimony, extensive work around the transfers and
24 the issues related to Acis. So we were familiar with their
25 impact on HCLOF.

Seery - Direct

44

1 We also did extensive work valuing the remaining HCLOF
2 interests to get a good feel of not only how much HarbourVest
3 originally invested, but how much they actually lost in this
4 transaction. And as I said, their original investment was
5 around, in total, in two tranches, about \$80 million, of which
6 they got about \$5 million back, and they've lost \$22 million.
7 So it -- I mean, remaining with \$22 million. So they've lost,
8 you know, in excess of \$50 million.

9 Q Do you recall whether the Debtor reviewed and analyzed all
10 of the documents that were cited in HarbourVest's response to
11 the Debtor's objection to the HarbourVest proofs of claim?

12 A Yeah. I think -- I forget, to be honest, which -- exactly
13 what documents were in there. But we went through their
14 objection with a fine-toothed comb, not only with respect to
15 the issues related to the Acis case, but also their references
16 to Guernsey law, other U.S. law, any of the documents between
17 the parties. And obviously, as I mentioned before, the
18 offering memorandum.

19 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I would just note for the
20 record that Debtor's Exhibits I through X are all of the
21 documents that are cited in HarbourVest's response to the
22 Debtor's objection to the HarbourVest proofs of claim, and
23 those are the documents that Mr. Seery just referred to.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. MORRIS: Just, they're in evidence now, and I

Seery - Direct

45

1 just wanted the Court to understand why they're in evidence.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. MORRIS: You're welcome.

4 BY MR. MORRIS:

5 Q Let's talk about the Debtor and whether or not it had or
6 has any viable defenses. Did the Debtor form any views as to
7 whether or not it had any defenses to the HarbourVest claims?

8 A Yes, we did.

9 Q Can you describe for the Court the defenses that were
10 reviewed and analyzed by the Debtor?

11 A Yeah. I think we -- we had very significant defenses.
12 So, first and foremost, with respect to the original proof of
13 claim, as I mentioned earlier, it alluded to the expenses and
14 the overcharge. And I think with respect to the 15 million of
15 fees that were charged to HCLOF by Highland, we didn't have a
16 lot of defenses to that claim.

17 It's pretty clear, by any fair view of the Acis case, that
18 HCLOF, as the investor in the Acis CLOs and the Highland CLOs,
19 had no real responsibility for fighting with Acis and Josh
20 Terry and shouldn't have been charged those fees. I don't --
21 I don't think there's a legitimate investor that would
22 actually think that that was an appropriate amount to be
23 charged to a fund.

24 However, the claim was not as broad -- the proof of claim
25 was not as fulsome in terms of discussing and only vaguely

1 referred to other damages. So we did -- we did, as a
2 threshold matter, think about whether we could argue that it
3 was time-barred because they had not met their obligations to
4 fully disclose under the proof of claim.

5 Secondly, we considered the defenses to the overall claim
6 of fraudulent inducement. Our perspective was that if we
7 could stop the claim of fraudulent inducement, the damages
8 would likely be limited to the 15 and maybe some -- some other
9 damages. With respect to the 15, again, the problem that we
10 had when we got past -- past motions for summary judgment is
11 the factual predicate for our defense was going to be that we
12 divulged these things to HarbourVest and that they did not
13 reasonably -- it was -- reasonably rely on some failure to
14 divulge because they're a sophisticated investor.

15 The problem with that defense is that our witnesses, which
16 really would have primarily been Mr. Dondero and Mr.
17 Ellington, and one other employee who runs the CLO business,
18 Mr. Covitz, would not be pretty good. They've been -- two of
19 them have been in front of this Court and they're not viewed
20 favorably and their testimony would be challenged and
21 potentially suspect.

22 So that gave us a real focus on trying to make sure that
23 we could, if we had to litigate, that we would litigate around
24 the fraudulent inducement.

25 As I said, reasonable reliance, what was disclosed, lack

Seery - Direct

47

1 of digging into the public record, because you don't have to
2 go far on Google to find "fraud" within two words of
3 "Highland," and the tremendous, you know, litigious nature of
4 Highland. You know, even at that point, when this investment
5 was made, aside from Mr. Terry's arbitration, which by that
6 point, at least by the time (inaudible) was public, there was,
7 you know, significant public disclosure around the Credit
8 Strat and the litigation, the Crusader litigation, the UBS
9 litigation, the, gosh knows, the Daugherty litigation.

10 So our defense was going to be that you should have
11 figured this out, you're a sophisticated investor, and you
12 should have been able to figure out that there was significant
13 risk that, with respect to Mr. Terry, that Mr. Dondero would
14 not stop litigating and that those costs would put significant
15 risk on the investment.

16 The problem with that, as I mentioned earlier, is that the
17 OM is wholly deficient. If you have a typical risk factor in
18 the offering memorandum, you would have disclosed that there
19 was a litigation with Mr. Terry, a former partner in the
20 business, and that the Debtor had no intention of settling it.
21 There was no intention of settling. That litigation would go
22 on. It could go on for years and it could result in
23 bankruptcy or attachments and other risks to the business, and
24 that the investor should be fully aware that the Offeror does
25 not intend to be involved in any -- or the manager, in any

1 settlement with Mr. Terry, and the fact it undermined the
2 investment. That wasn't there.

3 But that was our preliminary focus, to try to stop fraud
4 in the inducement. And then we -- we had specific facts
5 related to that. You know, once they knew about the
6 bankruptcy in HarbourVest of -- I'm sorry, of Acis,
7 HarbourVest made a second funding, which was there was a -- it
8 was an initial \$75 million draw, and then a second, I believe,
9 about a \$5 million draw, which was in -- I believe in
10 February. And they made it without -- without objection, and
11 that was after the commencement of the bankruptcy.

12 In addition, they were -- they were active in the
13 bankruptcy, so the -- some of the things that happened in the
14 bankruptcy, there were many opportunities to settle that case,
15 from our examination, all of which were turned down to -- by
16 Mr. Dondero. But you don't see HarbourVest pounding the table
17 to settle, either, either with respect to the Oaktree
18 transaction or any other transaction.

19 Now, HarbourVest's defense to that is, well, we were
20 taking advice and all of our information from Highland, and we
21 were getting that information directly from senior folks at
22 Highland why -- what the value was and why we shouldn't do
23 those things. We thought that that would mitigate some of the
24 arguments that -- some of the damages that we might have, I'm
25 sorry, if we -- if we lost.

Seery - Direct

49

1 But the focus at that point, you know, our legal strategy,
2 was can we stop HarbourVest at the very forefront to say,
3 You've got to come into the factual realm and get out of the
4 fraud in the inducement realm. And then the defenses and the
5 exculpations and the liability limitations in the documents
6 would also come into play.

7 So that -- those are some of the defenses that we focused
8 on and our analytical thinking around them.

9 Q So, if the Debtor had viable defenses, why is it settling?

10 A Well, this is a significant claim. And we -- we looked at
11 it with respect to both the impact on the case, but, really,
12 the merits of the claim.

13 As I said, there's really little dispute that the legal
14 fees should not have been charged to HarbourVest. We think
15 based upon the testimony in Acis, the suspect credibility of
16 those who would have been our witnesses, and the experience in
17 Acis that the Court has had in terms of the completely hell-
18 bent on litigation, it would be hard for anyone to justifiably
19 defend those fees being charged. So, as an initial matter, we
20 had exposure there.

21 In addition, if HarbourVest got by our defense of -- was
22 able, for example, to claim fraud in the inducement, then we
23 were open to significant damages.

24 We really didn't put much value, frankly, on the RICO part
25 of it. We think that that's waved around often to show treble

Seery - Direct

50

1 damages. Although in this case certainly somebody could lay
2 out the predicate acts and put forth a RICO-type argument, we
3 just didn't think that that had real merit in this commercial
4 dispute, even with a fraud claim.

5 But even without the trebling of the damages, there's no
6 dispute that HarbourVest lost more than \$50 million in this
7 investment. You know, we -- we thought about that risk as
8 well.

9 In addition, because the case would really be fact-based,
10 even if we had a high degree of confidence based upon our
11 discussions with our employees and the factual testimony, it
12 was going to be expensive to litigate this case, and time-
13 consuming.

14 And so we looked at the economic value, the potential
15 risks, and the actual value that we were giving up, and found
16 this to be an extremely, extremely reasonable settlement.

17 Importantly, and I think what drove it, you -- one of --
18 one of the things that drove it is another one of our defenses
19 on why, notwithstanding their -- what they held out as
20 meritorious claims, I don't think HarbourVest really wanted to
21 publicly litigate this claim. And we were aggressive in our
22 discussions with HarbourVest of how we would litigate it,
23 which would be quite publicly.

24 Now, that may or may not be fair, but that does put risk
25 on the counterparty. And so I think that helped drive the

Seery - Direct

51

1 settlement.

2 In addition, the structure of the settlement we think is
3 extremely favorable to the Debtor and to the estate because,
4 rather than taking the full claim and putting it into a senior
5 unsecured position, we have bifurcated it. We did think about
6 whether this was a claim that could be subordinated under 510.
7 There won't be any arguments, I would be surprised if there's
8 arguments today that we didn't actually give to the Highland
9 employees who have given them to Mr. Dondero's respective
10 counsel.

11 We did structure it in a way that we thought gave
12 HarbourVest the opportunity to effectively claim a rescission,
13 even though that's not really what it is, and then be able to
14 claim that their recovery is based on the bankruptcy, which it
15 is, but not really dilute all the other stakeholders in the
16 case.

17 (Pause.)

18 THE COURT: Mr. Morris? Anything else?

19 MR. MORRIS: I can hear you, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. MORRIS: I can hear you.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Now can you --

23 MR. MORRIS: I got cut off from Mr. Seery for a
24 moment.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

Seery - Direct

52

1 BY MR. MORRIS:

2 Q Okay. I appreciate that. Are you done giving the
3 Debtor's basis for entering into this settlement, Mr. Seery,
4 if you can hear me?

5 A I think so, but I think as the Court has probably seen, I
6 can go on.

7 Q Yes.

8 A So I will try to be -- I'll try to be more concise. But
9 this was a -- this was a difficult settlement. We felt good
10 about our defenses. Felt that we could -- we could try them.
11 But it would be extremely expensive, time-consuming, and there
12 would be a lot of risk. And settling at a level which we
13 believe is actually below the damages that were clearly caused
14 only by the fees was a -- was a -- is a -- is a very
15 reasonable settlement.

16 Q Okay. Let's just talk about the process by which we got
17 to the settlement. Do you recall generally when the
18 settlement negotiations have -- were commenced?

19 A I believe it was -- was late summer, early -- early fall.

20 Q Okay. Before I move on, I just want to go back to the
21 Acis matter that you were talking about, one last issue. Do
22 you know how, if at all, the injunction that was entered in
23 the Acis bankruptcy impacted or related to the HarbourVest
24 claims?

25 A Yeah. I -- yes, I do. And I believe it -- it did. I

Seery - Direct

53

1 think there's an argument, and we analyzed it thoroughly, that
2 the injunction effectively caused a lot of the damages.
3 Because if you look at the values of the equity that
4 HarbourVest had, the -- and HCLOF had in the CLOs, it went
5 down dramatically after the Trustee in the Acis case took over
6 and then subsequently, when the case was reorganized and Mr.
7 Terry took over, you know, with Brigade as the sub-advisor.

8 Now, that would -- you know, we would -- we could
9 certainly attempt to throw, in our defense, the causation at
10 Mr. Terry's feet or at Mr. Phelan's feet. HarbourVest's
11 retort is that none of this would have occurred but for the
12 burn-it-down litigation that Mr. Dondero engaged in with
13 Highland.

14 In addition, in Mr. Terry's defense, you know, he did try
15 multiple times with HCLOF, tried to petition, if you will, the
16 HCLOF entity to -- and directors, former directors, to reset
17 the CLOs to make them more economically viable, based upon the
18 current level of asset returns versus the debt costs in the
19 CLOs. And that was rejected by the HCLOF and the Debtor as
20 the controlling party of HCLOF. So, we thought about those
21 risks.

22 You know, similarly, the economic values in Acis 7 went
23 down pretty significantly from that date as well. So I think
24 there's -- there are some defenses, but that's really Mr.
25 Terry's issue, not our issue. So we thought about those

Seery - Direct

54

1 issues, we analyzed them, and we certainly did all the work
2 around month-to-month reductions in NAVs and how different
3 events in the Acis case might have -- might have caused those
4 and was that some sort of break from the original
5 transgression that HarbourVest claims, which was the
6 fraudulent inducement.

7 Q Do you recall that in November HarbourVest's motion under
8 3018 was scheduled to be heard?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And can you just tell the Court your understanding of what
11 the 3018 motion was about?

12 A Well, the 3018 motion was going to be on voting. And we
13 took the view that it really was not -- it shouldn't have been
14 that big an issue and HarbourVest should have been content
15 with just taking their actual losses of roughly a \$50-\$60
16 million claim for voting purposes and then we would move on.

17 HarbourVest was very insistent that they have a \$300
18 million claim, because they took the position -- and with
19 extensive documentation; not only the pleadings they filed,
20 but also detailed decks that were prepared by their counsel,
21 which they had presented to us on the merits of their claim --
22 that they were going to litigate for -- the 3018 and for the
23 full \$300 million value.

24 And that became the genesis, if you will, of the
25 negotiations to settle.

Seery - Direct

55

1 So, we started talking about the 3018. It was very
2 contentious. My apologies to Ms. Weisgerber and her counsel,
3 her partners, because it was a significant and contentious
4 negotiating call. But the reasons for that I think were that
5 -- their insistence on litigating the 3018 and our view that
6 this was just, you know, another -- another of a series of
7 delays and costs in this case that we really were hoping to
8 avoid.

9 That led to Mr. Pugatch and I stepping away from counsel,
10 no offense to counsel, you know, ours and his, to begin
11 negotiations around the potential for a settlement. First, it
12 started with a 3018, and then, you know, argued that we would,
13 if we got past the 3018, we were going to litigate this,
14 because we effectively had -- thought we could get everyone
15 else done at -- in and around that time. And I think we were
16 also probably a little bit optimistic about UBS at that time
17 and the mediation, which subsequently we have settled. But
18 that was the genesis of those settlements.

19 Q And how did the structure, how did the Debtor and
20 HarbourVest derive at the structure whereby there is a general
21 unsecured claim, there is a subordinated piece, and there's
22 the takeback of the HCLOF interest?

23 A Well, as I outlined, we -- we aggressively set forth our
24 various defenses. Their position was that they -- they should
25 never have been in this transaction before. And they --

1 HarbourVest is, in essence, a fund of funds, and they have
2 investors, and it certainly wouldn't be their, I'm sure, the
3 best-performing asset in their portfolio, to have made this
4 investment and lost \$50 million over this period of time. So
5 they felt strongly that they should never have been in this
6 investment, and but for the failure to disclose and the
7 improper disclosures, they would not have been in this
8 investment.

9 So, optically, getting out of it was important to them,
10 and that led to our idea and construction of a subordinated
11 claim and the transfer of the HCLOF interests to the estate.

12 Importantly, the HCLOF interests, as I mentioned, are --
13 the investments are in the Acis CLOs controlled by Acis and
14 Mr. Terry. The reorganized Acis. As well as the 1.0 CLOs and
15 the Acis 7.

16 So we were keenly focused on, if we were going to get that
17 interest, would we then have the majority control in HCLOF,
18 which we will, and would we be able to drive the recoveries,
19 as opposed to what Highland typically does in these
20 investments is use other people's money, drive down the value,
21 and then try to buy back the interest on the cheap.

22 Q Just in terms of timing, because I think there was a
23 suggestion in one of the openings that there was something
24 untoward about the timing here: At the time the liquidation
25 analysis was prepared on November 24th, had the Debtor reached

Seery - Direct

57

1 any agreement in principle with HarbourVest?

2 A If we had, it would have been reflected, so I don't -- I
3 don't think we were agreed by then. I don't recall the
4 specific dates, but if we had, it would have -- it would have
5 been reflected.

6 Q If I can refresh your recollection that the motion was
7 filed on December 24th, does that help form your understanding
8 or refresh your recollection that there was no agreement in
9 principle on November 24th?

10 A Yeah. Well, I'm quite sure there was no agreement in
11 principle or we would have reflected it minimally by a
12 footnote. There's -- there's no chance. It's a material
13 reduction in the claims pool that we were previously telling
14 people that, at least for purposes of distribution, like UBS
15 and a couple others we said we thought we would get to zero
16 on. So we didn't calculate in that amount. So I'm quite sure
17 we didn't have a deal when we filed the disclosure statement.

18 In terms of the timing, anyone who's done this business
19 for any degree of time knows that the crucible of bankruptcy
20 brings people to the settlement when they see something
21 happening in the case, and not before. I think HarbourVest
22 looked at our -- this is my supposition -- HarbourVest looked
23 at our plan, our ability to get this done, our settlement with
24 Redeemer, our settlement with Mr. Terry and Acis, and saw that
25 this plan was coming together, and if they didn't think about

Seery - Direct

58

1 the settlement, they were going to think about not only the
2 risks that we laid forth for them with respect our defenses,
3 but also the opportunity to litigate with the Claimant Trustee
4 over a long period of time, which couldn't have been
5 particularly appetizing.

6 Q Can you describe for the Court the role played by the
7 independent board of Strand, the general partner of the
8 Debtor, in analyzing and participating in the approval
9 process?

10 A Yes. I think, as the Court is aware and I've testified
11 before, Mr. Russell Nelms and Mr. John Dubel are fellow
12 independent directors with me, appointed pursuant to the Court
13 order. They are kept abreast of every detail, and -- along
14 the way, not just in a summary form at the end. We have
15 reviewed and analyzed collectively each of the issues. Mr.
16 Dubel has extensive experience in these types of litigation
17 matters. Obviously, Mr. Nelms, from his -- both his practice
18 and his time on the bench, has a keen insight into how to
19 resolve and what the risks and benefits are from settling
20 litigation. So I consult them every step of the way.

21 Q And as part of this process, did the Debtor reach out to
22 the directors of HCLOF?

23 A Yes, we did. So, we reached out and we've had several
24 conversations on video chats with the directors. The
25 directors of HCLOF are two new gentlemen, Mr. Richard Boleat

Seery - Direct

59

1 and Mr. Dicky Burwood. They are extremely professional. They
2 are exceptionally well-informed. They are truly careful, and
3 I would say very experienced professional not only directors,
4 but experienced in -- in these matters, both in respect of
5 structured finance as well as these types of vehicles and
6 litigation.

7 They were appointed by the old directors, Scott and
8 Bestwick, and they have been in control. They have outside
9 counsel, which is King & Spalding in the U.S. They have
10 Guernsey counsel. They have accountants and professional
11 advisors, and are being, in my opinion, exceptionally careful.
12 I've got -- very quickly developed a lot of respect for them,
13 and we consulted with them on this settlement and how it would
14 work.

15 They've been very clear that they represent HCLOF and they
16 work for the benefit of the equity, whomever owns it, and
17 taking a view that they would like to see these assets
18 monetized swiftly, with due regard to value, for the benefit
19 of the equity.

20 Q And is it your understanding that the directors of HCLOF
21 approved of this transaction?

22 A They -- I don't know that their approval was required.
23 It's really -- there are a number of hoops to jump through
24 under the documentation, including opinion of outside counsel
25 that we received from WilmerHale in terms of the effectiveness

Seery - Direct

60

1 of the transfer under the documents. We had a negotiation
2 with -- with those directors, and making sure that we did
3 everything correct -- correctly, excuse me -- with respect to
4 the requirements for the transfer under the documents. And
5 they've indicated their support and acknowledgement that we're
6 doing it correctly.

7 I don't know if it's fair to say they approved it. I'd
8 just have to go check the documents. But they certainly
9 support it. And I think they generally support our position
10 with respect to how to move forward with the assets.

11 Q I appreciate that. I guess I meant approval with a small
12 a and not a capital A.

13 You mentioned WilmerHale. Who do they represent in all of
14 this?

15 A WilmerHale is the Debtor's outside corporate counsel, in
16 particular with respect to the fund issues that we don't
17 handle in-house. We have significant support for fund issues
18 from the expertise of Mr. Surgent, who's been the CCO, and he
19 is also a lawyer, with respect to, you know, some of the
20 difficult fund issues that Highland has. But when we use
21 outside counsel, we use WilmerHale for that, and they've been
22 -- they've been exceptional.

23 Q Okay. Just the last two points that were made in Mr.
24 Dondero's objection, I believe. Did the Debtor overpay in
25 this settlement in order to gain the support of HarbourVest in

Seery - Direct

61

1 connection with its -- with the Debtor's attempt to get its
2 plan confirmed?

3 A Not in any way. My -- I believe the settlement is
4 extremely reasonable. As I testified, it's -- it's less than
5 the -- the actual value going out, depending on unless there's
6 successful litigation, and there well could be, is less than
7 on a pro forma basis the fees that were taken and charged to
8 HCLOF. We didn't do this for votes. We will have Class 2,
9 Class 7, Class 8, and Class 9. So I don't think that's a --
10 there's no vote purchasing, I think you called it. No, not at
11 all.

12 Q Yeah. Well, on that topic, I think the phrase that was
13 used was gerrymandering. Are you aware of the argument that's
14 been made that the subordinated claim was dropped in there in
15 order to gerrymander a positive vote for the impaired class of
16 Class 9, I believe?

17 A In a word, I would say that's preposterous. The -- as I
18 said, we have a number of classes that will vote for the plan.
19 The plan is -- the plan is a monetization plan. And if -- if
20 the creditors determine that they don't want to pursue this
21 plan, we'll go forward with another -- we'll try to get
22 another plan. We tried to have a grand bargain plan. We
23 tried to have a pot plan, as I've testified previously. I'm
24 quite certain that I've done more work on that than anyone
25 else, including Mr. Dondero and anybody who works for him.

Seery - Direct

62

1 And he hasn't been willing to do that.

2 This is a -- this is a plan that's come together. We
3 think it's going to be in the best interests of the estate.
4 That'll be confirmation next week. Or two weeks, I guess.
5 But I don't see how this is any way related -- this settlement
6 is not any way related to the voting on that -- on that -- on
7 that plan.

8 Q Just to put the finest point on it, is the Debtor relying
9 on Class 9 to be the impaired consenting class?

10 A No. I think -- I think what I've -- as I said, I believe
11 we already have the votes in Class -- I think it's 2 or 3, 7,
12 8, and -- and 9 will vote in favor as well. So that won't be
13 an issue.

14 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I have no further questions
15 of Mr. Seery.

16 THE COURT: All right. Pass the witness. I'll ask
17 HarbourVest counsel first: Do you have any questions of Mr.
18 Seery?

19 MS. WEISGERBER: No, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

21 What about cross-examination? Mr. Dondero's counsel?

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. WILSON:

24 Q Mr. Seery, how are you doing today?

25 A I'm well, thank you.

1 Q I'm John Wilson, and I represent Jim Dondero. I have a
2 few questions for you today.

3 Now, the HarbourVest proof of claims were filed on April
4 8th, 2020; is that your recollection?

5 A I believe that's correct. I don't recall the specific
6 date.

7 Q Okay. And do you know when you first became aware of the
8 HarbourVest claims?

9 A I believe it was early in the summer when we filed the
10 omnibus objection. It may have been in late spring, shortly
11 after that. I don't recall the specific date of the filing.

12 Q And before the time of the filing of the omnibus
13 objection, did Highland educate itself regarding the
14 HarbourVest proof of claims?

15 A I'm sorry, could you say that again? I didn't quite
16 understand it.

17 Q Before the omnibus objection was filed, did HarbourVest --
18 I'm sorry, did Highland educate itself on the HarbourVest
19 proof of claims?

20 A Not especially, no.

21 Q Okay. And -- but at some point, Highland did investigate
22 those proofs of claim, correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And when would you -- when do you recall that that
25 investigation began?

1 A I don't recall the date, but the triggering event was
2 HarbourVest's response to our omnibus objection.

3 Q Okay. And that would have been filed September 11th of
4 2020?

5 A I'll take your representation. I don't -- I don't recall
6 the specific date.

7 Q Okay. And so when you began to investigate the
8 HarbourVest claims, what was your initial reaction?

9 A My initial reaction was that the -- the larger claims that
10 they were asserting -- the fraud in the inducement, the RICO
11 -- that those claims were, in my view, attorney-made and that
12 when we dug in and did the work, we saw that HarbourVest
13 clearly lost north of \$50 million on the investment. We had
14 just started to uncover the fee issue and saw the risk we had
15 there.

16 But I thought the bulk of those claims were attorney-made.
17 Clever, but attorney-made, as opposed to what I would think
18 are more legitimate. And so we started to develop our
19 defenses around that.

20 Q And was your initial reaction that the HarbourVest claims
21 were largely worthless?

22 A I think with respect to the claim around the fees, I
23 believed there was significant risk. With respect to the
24 other claims, I thought our defenses would make them
25 worthless, yes.

1 Q And did you ever represent to any party that the
2 HarbourVest claim was worth, at most, \$5 million?

3 A I think I represented often, including to HarbourVest,
4 that it was worth nothing. I don't recall if I specifically
5 said \$5 million. \$5 million would have been a nominal amount
6 to -- which is litigation costs. So it may -- it may have
7 been in my models that I put in that as a settlement amount,
8 but I -- I thought that there were valid and good defenses to
9 those larger claims.

10 Q And you recognize that HarbourVest was a large,
11 sophisticated investor, correct?

12 A Yes. I think they manage north of -- right around a
13 hundred billion dollars.

14 Q And you recognize that HarbourVest routinely structured
15 complex customized investments, correct?

16 A I believe that -- I don't know the intricate part of their
17 businesses, but as a fund of funds who does creative
18 investments, I think that they do do quite a bit of that.
19 This, I believe, was their first investment in the CLO space.

20 Q And it was not -- or I should say, you did not believe
21 that HarbourVest was simply a passive investor in HCLOF,
22 correct?

23 A I don't think that that's true, no.

24 Q You don't -- you don't believe that you denied their claim
25 to be a passive investor?

1 A Oh, I think -- I'm sure that in defense of their claims I
2 would argue that they were -- they were more than a passive
3 investor. But it was pretty clear when you look at the
4 structure of what they invested that there was an intent that
5 they be passive on their part. They didn't take a majority
6 interest.

7 In fact, Highland made it clear in the structure of the
8 deal that they couldn't -- it would be hard for them to get a
9 majority interest because Highland entities would control that
10 and Dondero-controlled entities or individuals would control
11 the majority.

12 I think that they -- they had hoped to be a passive
13 investor.

14 Q But was it not your position that HarbourVest was actually
15 an active, involved investor?

16 A I think our defense was going to be that they knew exactly
17 what was going on, that they participated, that they were
18 active, and that, indeed, that they were in and around some of
19 the subsequent issues in the Acis case.

20 Q And you understood that HarbourVest played a material role
21 in the various outcomes in the Acis bankruptcy case, correct?

22 A I don't believe that to be correct, no.

23 Q Have you ever made that representation to anyone before?

24 A Not -- not that I recall.

25 Q Well, do you recall giving statements to a reporter named

Seery - Cross

67

1 Syed Khaderi?

2 A I've never spoken to a reporter named Syed Khaderi in my
3 life.

4 Q Well, did you participate in the preparation of statements
5 to be given to Syed Khaderi?

6 A I've never heard of Syed Khaderi, nor have I participated
7 in any preparation of statements. I don't know who that is.

8 MR. WILSON: All right. I'm going to have Bryan
9 Assink put on the screen a document.

10 And Bryan, can you go to Page 7? Bottom of -- the top of
11 Page 7. Well, actually, before you do that, go to the very
12 top of the document.

13 BY MR. WILSON:

14 Q Now, Mr. Seery, are you familiar with Lucy Bannon?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And who is Lucy Bannon?

17 A She is the Highland public relations person.

18 MR. WILSON: Okay. Now go back to Page 7.

19 BY MR. WILSON:

20 Q Now, do you -- do you see on your screen an email of
21 September 14th from Syed Khaderi that says, Hi, Lucy, how are
22 you?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Have you seen this email before?

25 A Not that I recall, no.

Seery - Cross

68

1 Q All right. It continues on that, I saw the filing on
2 Friday about HarbourVest claims against Highland for a CLO
3 investment, and I'm looking to put out a report tomorrow
4 morning London time. Ahead of that, I wanted to check if
5 Highland would like to comment on the matter.

6 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, this is -- the Debtor
7 respectfully objects. A, this document is not in evidence.
8 B, it's rank hearsay.

9 THE COURT: Response, Mr. Wilson?

10 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, I am attempting to
11 authenticate this document, but I'm using it in rebuttal to
12 the testimony that Mr. Seery just offered.

13 THE COURT: All right. I'll allow it. Overrule the
14 objection.

15 MR. WILSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

16 BY MR. WILSON:

17 Q All right. Now, if we -- and oh, that September 14th
18 date, that was three days after the September 11th date that
19 we discussed was the date that HarbourVest filed its response
20 to the omnibus objection, correct?

21 A Yes. If that's the date that they filed it, then I -- if
22 you're representing that, I concede that the 14th is three
23 days after the 11th.

24 Q All right. And if you go back to the first page of this,
25 it looks like, on the following day, Lucy Bannon sends an

Seery - Cross

69

1 email to you, and is that your email address,
2 jpseeryjr@gmail.com?

3 A That's correct, yes.

4 Q And do you recall receiving this email from Lucy Bannon?

5 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I renew my objection that
6 this is hearsay. He's not rebutting anything that Mr. Seery
7 testified to. He testified that he'd never heard of the
8 gentleman at the bottom of the document. There's nothing in
9 this document that rebuts Mr. Seery's testimony at all.

10 THE COURT: Response, Mr. Wilson?

11 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm not -- I'm not trying to rebut
12 his statement that he hadn't -- that he hadn't heard of Syed
13 Khaderi. My rebuttal is attempted to -- attempting to show
14 that he has made various statements that he denied.

15 THE COURT: I'll overrule the objection.

16 BY MR. WILSON:

17 Q All right. So, back to this exhibit, Mr. Seery. You
18 recall receiving this email from Lucy Bannon on Tuesday,
19 September 15, 2020?

20 A Not specifically. But to be clear, I recall talking to
21 Lucy Bannon about the HCMLP dispute with HarbourVest.

22 Q Okay. And --

23 MR. WILSON: Bryan, can you go down to the next page?
24 Scroll down to where -- the James Seery email.

25 BY MR. WILSON:

Seery - Cross

70

1 Q Do you see this email on your screen that's dated
2 September 15, 2020 at 10:33 p.m.?

3 A Yes, I do.

4 Q And do you recall sending this email to Lucy?

5 A Not specifically, no.

6 Q Well, do you deny that you sent this email to Lucy?

7 A It appears to be my email.

8 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, we would move to admit this
9 document into evidence as Dondero Exhibit Letter N.

10 THE COURT: Any objections?

11 MR. MORRIS: I would consent to the admission of Mr.
12 Seery's email, but the balance of it ought to be excluded as
13 hearsay.

14 THE COURT: What about that?

15 MR. WILSON: Well, Your Honor, I think that this
16 document -- and I'll get into this in a little more detail in
17 a second -- but I think this document is a combination of the
18 work product of Lucy Bannon and Mr. Seery in preparing a
19 response for the reporter who requested comment from Highland.

20 THE COURT: Okay. I --

21 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, um, --

22 THE COURT: Go ahead.

23 MR. MORRIS: I just -- I do question how they got
24 this document, but that's for another day. That's number one.
25 Number two, in addition to the hearsay argument, I just --

Seery - Cross

71

1 relevance grounds.

2 THE COURT: Okay. I'll allow the portion that is the
3 communication of Seery, that portion of Exhibit N. All right?

4 MR. WILSON: Okay. With due -- thank you, Your
5 Honor. With due respect, I -- to use that portion, I need to
6 refer to the portion below it, because he says, Good to submit
7 with your final edit/revisions. And so we need to know what
8 those final edit/revisions are, which are contained in the
9 email directly below that on the document that was four
10 minutes earlier in time.

11 THE COURT: All right. Fair enough. That'll be
12 allowed.

13 MR. WILSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

14 (James Dondero's Exhibit N is received into evidence as
15 specified.)

16 MR. WILSON: So, Bryan, now can you scroll to the
17 next page? Oh, actually, let's just -- let's just stop at the
18 top -- at the bottom of the page. What's this statement?

19 BY MR. WILSON:

20 Q So, to be clear, Mr. Seery, when -- in response to Mr.
21 Khaderi's request for information and comment, you prepared
22 actually two responses, and one of those was a statement on
23 the record attributed to a spokesperson for HCMLP or something
24 along those lines. And then --

25 MR. WILSON: Can you scroll down to that next page?

1 BY MR. WILSON:

2 Q And this says -- I think part of this got cut off for some
3 reason, but it looks like the official statement is in
4 quotation marks. It says, "We dispute the allegations made in
5 the filing and believe the underlying claims are invalid and
6 will be found to be without merit. Our focus continues to be
7 treating all valid claims in a transparent, orderly, and
8 equitable manner, and vigorously disputing meritless in the
9 court. That focus will assure that HCMLP's reorganization
10 process -- progress is towards an efficient and equitable
11 resolution."

12 And then below that there's another section of this email
13 that says, Background/Clarification, Not for Attribution. And
14 do you know the purpose of this second section of the
15 response?

16 A Do I know the purpose of that? Yes.

17 Q And what would that purpose be?

18 A Ms. Bannon was speaking on background to reporters. As I
19 said earlier, I've -- I never heard of the gentleman from
20 London. If he's at the bottom of the email, I didn't pay any
21 mind, never heard of him. Nor have I heard it since. Ms.
22 Bannon didn't ever reference the specific person.

23 But she is the public relations person. So, as I
24 testified earlier, she does communicate with the press. And
25 as I previously testified when Mr. Morris questioned me, one

1 of our tactics and our defenses for HarbourVest was going to
2 be that we were going to be very public and aggressive about
3 the investment and it would have a negative impact or negative
4 perspective for viewers, in our opinion, about HarbourVest's
5 investment.

6 Q All right. Well, look with me in the middle of that
7 paragraph right after the closed parenthetical, where it says,
8 "But it's important to note the background of HarbourVest's
9 active and deep involvement in the investment of which it now
10 complains."

11 And so it was your position that HarbourVest had an active
12 and deep involvement in the investment, correct?

13 A No. I don't think that's correct. Ms. Bannon prepared
14 the statement, it was a litigation defense on background, and
15 that's our -- that was our position for this purpose. It was
16 not my view that they were active and deeply involved. They
17 were certainly involved. There's no doubt about it. But they
18 got all their information, in our estimation and our research,
19 from Highland.

20 Q But in any event, you would agree with me that four
21 minutes after receiving this email, you approved this
22 statement to go out to the reporter, correct?

23 A No, that's not correct. That's -- this portion is on
24 background. That statement doesn't go out. The previous
25 statement was the official statement. This is the background

1 discussion that she would have. So, no, she was not
2 authorized in any way whatsoever to send that out. She was
3 authorized to have conversations with those general facts.

4 MR. WILSON: Okay. Bryan, go to the top, or the
5 bottom of the page immediately preceding that. That's it.
6 Yes, that's it right there.

7 BY MR. WILSON:

8 Q Now, you'll see that this email from Lucy Bannon on
9 September 15, 2020 at 10:29 p.m. starts off, "Jim, let me know
10 what you think of the below. And, again, the first would be
11 on the record and the second will be sent for information
12 purposes to ensure accuracy, not for attribution."

13 So the intent was that this -- that this entire statement
14 be sent to the reporter, correct?

15 A I don't believe that's correct. I think when she goes on
16 background she doesn't send them a written doc. It's got to
17 be clear to the reporter, at least my understanding is that
18 what on background means -- I've been involved with this
19 before -- is that typically that's done orally. I don't know
20 if she's done it in a written statement before. I have never
21 seen that done in a written statement before. You give the
22 official statement and then you walk the reporter through your
23 other views on background. And you're not quoted. And it's
24 usually attributed to a source with knowledge.

25 Q Okay. We'll come back to that in a minute. The next

1 sentence after the one I just read to you --

2 MR. WILSON: Go back to where we were on the
3 background.

4 BY MR. WILSON:

5 Q Now, we just read you the sentence that starts with, "Then
6 it's important." The following sentence says, "HarbourVest
7 was not simply invested in HCLOF as an ignorant,
8 unsophisticated, passive investor, but was an active and
9 informed participant in the inception of its investment
10 through all of the Acis bankruptcy proceedings, and
11 HarbourVest played a material role in various outcomes related
12 to that case and its impact on HCLOF."

13 And is it -- did you not just tell me before we
14 investigated this document that HarbourVest did not play a
15 material role in the various outcomes of the Acis bankruptcy?

16 A I don't know exactly what I said, but I think that's
17 correct, after we'd done the research on it, yeah.

18 Q But you took the position in this email that you approved
19 to go out to a reporter that says that -- that HarbourVest was
20 an active and informed participant in the inception of -- of
21 its investment through all of the Acis bankruptcy proceedings
22 and played a material role in various outcomes related to that
23 case and its impact on HCLOF. Can we agree with that?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And then the final sentence of this paragraph says that,

Seery - Cross

76

1 We believe that neither the facts nor the law support
2 HarbourVest's, quote, We-were-too-lazy-to-know allegations.

3 Whose words were those, "We-were-too-lazy-to-know
4 allegations"?

5 A I don't recall. They may be mine. It's aggressive the
6 way I am, so that -- that may well be the case.

7 MR. WILSON: All right. Go -- go down to the next
8 page.

9 BY MR. WILSON:

10 Q And with respect your comment that that second paragraph
11 would not have gone to the reporter, look at this email in the
12 middle of the page from Lucy Bannon to Syed Khaderi, September
13 16, 2020, at 1:51 a.m. And --

14 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, this I will object to as
15 hearsay. There is no witness here to testify to anything on
16 this document.

17 THE COURT: All right. How about that?

18 MR. WILSON: Well, it's -- well, scroll up just a
19 little bit. This email at the top of the page is three
20 minutes after the one in the middle of the page, where Lucy
21 Bannon is forwarding this to James Seery, saying, See below
22 for responses sent to *Creditflux*. Will follow up with the
23 story when it runs or with any other updates.

24 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, these --

25 MR. WILSON: So I think this --

Seery - Cross

77

1 MR. MORRIS: These documents don't appear on the
2 witness list. They're not being offered to impeach anything.
3 They're just -- he's taking discovery as we sit here.

4 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, in response, I'm simply
5 trying to rebut the statements that Mr. Seery made. In fact,
6 he told me just a minute ago that that second paragraph would
7 not have gone out to the reporter. However, this email from
8 Lucy Bannon to Syed Khaderi directly rebuts that statement.

9 THE COURT: But your whole purpose in this line of
10 questioning, with an undisclosed document, is to rebut the
11 earlier testimony he gave before you even put this exhibit in
12 front of him.

13 MR. WILSON: I'm trying to rebut multiple statements
14 that Mr. Seery has made today, and I think it -- you know, if
15 he's going to testify that this information did not go out to
16 a reporter, I think I'm allowed to rebut that to demonstrate
17 that it did.

18 THE COURT: All right. Why didn't you disclose this
19 in advance? It's feeling less and less like an impeachment
20 document the more we go through it.

21 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, I did not -- I did not
22 actually have this document at the time we filed our witness
23 and exhibit list, but I would also say that I didn't have any
24 purpose to use it if I didn't need it for rebuttal.

25 THE COURT: Okay. First off, you're supposed to

1 disclose all exhibits you anticipate using except those for
2 purposes of impeachment. Okay? Not rebuttal, to be
3 technical.

4 So, if you didn't disclose this exhibit, the only way you
5 can use it, subject to other possible objections, is if you're
6 impeaching a statement. And I'm just saying I think we're
7 going beyond trying to impeach the original statement and now
8 we're trying to impeach statements he's made after seeing
9 portions of the document.

10 What did you mean, you didn't have this document in time
11 to disclose it?

12 MR. WILSON: Well, I actually just received this
13 document this morning, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Where did you receive it from?

15 MR. MORRIS: From who?

16 MR. WILSON: I -- I honestly do not know the source
17 of this document, although it was provided to me by my client.

18 MR. MORRIS: Your client being Mr. Dondero?

19 THE COURT: Could you answer that, Mr. Wilson?

20 MR. WILSON: Yes, that's -- yes, that's correct.

21 THE COURT: All right. I will -- that's --

22 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I'd like to --

23 THE COURT: That's a different can of worms. But for
24 now, I sustain the objection. You're done questioning on this
25 document.

Seery - Cross

79

1 MR. WILSON: That's fine, Your Honor. I can move on.

2 BY MR. WILSON:

3 Q Now, Mr. Seery, you would agree with me that whether or
4 not HarbourVest played an active role in the Acis bankruptcy,
5 it was kept apprised of the -- of the ongoing in the
6 bankruptcy? (Pause.) I'm sorry. Could you hear that?

7 A Yes. My understanding is that -- that they were.

8 Q And in fact, did Highland have weekly conference calls
9 with HarbourVest during the Acis bankruptcy to discuss what
10 was going on in the bankruptcy?

11 A I don't know if they were weekly. I've been told that
12 they had regular calls updating HarbourVest, yes.

13 Q Okay. And did Highland produce over 40,000 pages of
14 documents to HarbourVest related to the Acis bankruptcy?

15 A I'm not aware of that, no.

16 Q Have those documents been provided to you?

17 A I hope not.

18 Q So, in your role --

19 A I'm sorry. I don't -- I didn't receive 40,000 documents
20 from anybody.

21 Q Well, did you receive any number of documents that were
22 provided by Highland to HarbourVest during the Acis
23 bankruptcy?

24 A I wasn't involved in this during the Acis bankruptcy. I'm
25 sorry.

1 Q Well, I'm referring to, after you became involved in this
2 Highland bankruptcy, whether you were provided with these
3 documents that were sent from Highland to HarbourVest.

4 A I don't -- I don't know what the documents are. I've
5 reviewed tons of documents with respect to the HarbourVest
6 claims, but I don't know of the documents to which you're
7 referring.

8 Q Okay. And after you performed your investigation into the
9 HarbourVest claim, what was your opinion as to the cause in
10 the reduction in value of HarbourVest's investment in HCLOF?

11 A I think the main cause of the reduction in the investment
12 was the imposition of the Trustee and the failure of Highland
13 HCLOF and then subsequently with the injunction to reset the
14 CLOs.

15 You know, these are -- these are some of the worst-
16 performing CLOs in the market because they weren't reset. And
17 when the liabilities of the CLOs are set at a level to match
18 assets, and then liability -- the assets run off, and the
19 asset financings or the new deals come in at much lower
20 levels, and the obligations of the CLO are not reset, the
21 arbitrage that is the CLO shrinks. And that's what happened
22 to these CLOs.

23 Q And during the course of the Acis bankruptcy, Acis and
24 Brigade were given management responsibilities over the CLOs
25 and HCLOF, correct?

1 A I believe that the Trustee had the overall, and then
2 subsequently, with the confirmation of the plan, they took it
3 over. So I think that ultimately Mr. Terry had the management
4 authority, full management authority, and some advice through
5 Brigade. But I think technically it wasn't actually during
6 the Chapter 7. The Chapter 7 proceeding, I believe that Mr.
7 Phelan had the actual authority.

8 (Echoing.)

9 Q I'm sorry. And so your testimony is that Mr. Phelan had
10 the actual authority but he delegated that authority to Josh
11 Terry and Brigade?

12 A I think that's fair, yes.

13 Q And do you know when that occurred?

14 A I believe that the control of the CLOs was in July of
15 2018, and then the ultimate confirmation of the case was at
16 the very beginning of '19.

17 Q So, after being instituted as portfolio manager, and
18 during the time when Acis and Brigade were working under the
19 direction of the Trustee, who would have receive the fees for
20 managing those portfolios?

21 A I believe -- I don't know. I believe the -- that the Acis
22 estate would have received those fees.

23 Q And who -- and so is that your testimony, that prior to
24 confirmation the Acis estate would have received the
25 management fees?

Seery - Cross

82

1 A I believe that -- I believe they would have if they were
2 the manager, yeah.

3 Q Okay. And who would have received the fees after
4 confirmation?

5 A Acis.

6 Q Okay. And who would have had the discretion to set the
7 amount of those management fees?

8 A They would be agreed to in the -- in the investment
9 management agreement.

10 Q They would be agreed to?

11 A Yes. As far as I've seen, I've -- I haven't seen
12 unilateral ability of a manager to set fees at its -- at its
13 whim.

14 Q So is it your understanding that Acis and Brigade ended up
15 charging substantially more fees than Highland had charged
16 when it was under Highland's management?

17 A I think the fees were -- the fees were -- the fees were
18 set by the agreement.

19 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I just object to the line of
20 questioning on relevance grounds. This is a 9019 hearing,
21 Your Honor. How -- I just don't think this has any relevance
22 at all.

23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wilson, what is the
24 relevance?

25 MR. WILSON: The relevance is that Mr. Seery has

1 testified that these Acis CLOs were among the worst-performing
2 in the market, and frankly, we would agree with that, and I'm
3 trying to get his understanding as to why, because I think
4 there's direct relevance in the reason that the value of the
5 HarbourVest investment diminished.

6 MR. MORRIS: I don't think that was his testimony,
7 Your Honor. But at the end of the day, Your Honor has heard
8 the litany of reasons why the Debtor is entering into this
9 agreement. I just, I just think it's irrelevant, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wilson, I barely think
11 this is relevant. I mean, I'm going to give you some benefit
12 of the doubt on that because of, you know, the testimony that
13 HarbourVest lost \$50 million of value and --

14 (Echoing.)

15 THE COURT: -- maybe that shouldn't, you know, lie at
16 the feet of Highland. I think the compromise reflects that
17 they don't -- it doesn't lie entirely at the feet of Highland.
18 But, you know, maybe two or three more questions.

19 MR. WILSON: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. And I
20 didn't have very much more on this point. But to be a hundred
21 percent honest, I can't remember my question right before the
22 objection.

23 THE WITNESS: I think you were asking me about the
24 fees and somehow alluding or implying that the manager could
25 unilaterally set fees.

1 The fees are set in the investment management contract.

2 The manager doesn't get to wake up on Wednesday and say, you
3 know, I'd like another half a basis point. It doesn't work
4 that way.

5 BY MR. WILSON:

6 Q But you would agree with me that the fees and expenses
7 charged to an investment would impact the performance of that
8 investment in the market?

9 A Absolutely.

10 Q Would you also agree with me that there was one CLO -- and
11 I think you referred to it in your direct testimony -- but CLO
12 7, which continued to be managed by Highland?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q And is it fair to say that CLO 7 exceeded the performance
15 of the CLOs that were managed by Acis and Brigade?

16 A I think that's fair. I don't -- I don't recall the
17 magnitude, but I think it's outperformed those -- those CLOs,
18 yes.

19 Q All right. Well, thank you. I want to turn your
20 attention to the portion of the settlement agreement that
21 deals with voting of the HarbourVest claim. How did
22 HarbourVest's commitment to vote for the plan become a part of
23 the settlement?

24 A Pretty straightforward negotiation. We -- in negotiating
25 the settlement, one of the key factors was the cost and

Seery - Cross

85

1 expense of the litigation, in addition to the risk on the --
2 on the fees, and whether we could wrap this up in a global
3 settlement now. So in my experience, it's fairly typical, we
4 would try to do this in every settlement, have the settling
5 party, be that the claimant, agree to support the case and the
6 plan.

7 You know, we did not do that with the Committee members,
8 although we wanted to. (Echoing) I frankly still wish I had.
9 Those little -- little bits that have been difficult
10 (echoing). The Committee members have a different interest in
11 (echoing) than their more global interest for creditors at
12 large, which is more difficult than traditionally in
13 bankruptcy cases, less likely to have a Committee member, a
14 sitting Committee member, actually support the (echoing) of
15 the plan.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Wilson, could you be careful to put
17 your device on mute every time you're not talking? Because
18 we're getting some feedback loop from you when Mr. Seery
19 answers your questions. Okay?

20 (Echoing continues.)

21 THE COURT: Like right now. I'm hearing feedback of
22 my own voice through your speakers.

23 Right, Mike? Isn't that what --

24 A VOICE: I am, too.

25 THE COURT: Yes. Okay. So please be sure you put

1 your device on mute whenever you are not speaking. All right.
2 Go ahead.

3 BY MR. WILSON:

4 Q I mean, I think you just answered this question, but there
5 was -- there was no similar voting provision in the Acis or
6 the Redeemer settlements, correct?

7 A There is not, no. And just as a -- by way of explanation,
8 if it's okay, the reason was my counsel advised against it. I
9 did ask for it.

10 Q Your counsel advised against putting that voting
11 requirement in the Acis and Redeemer settlements?

12 A For the reasons I stated. And in my experience, that's
13 consistent, where sitting members of Committees don't
14 generally sign up to resolve their own claims and support the
15 plan because of their larger fiduciary duties to the creditor
16 body as a whole.

17 Q And during the settlement negotiations of the HarbourVest
18 claim, was this commitment to vote a topic of discussion?

19 A Not -- not particularly, no. It was pretty clear that
20 HarbourVest, if they were going to agree to the settlement and
21 the numbers, could see structure. Obviously, it wanted to
22 understand what the potential distributions would be under the
23 plan, but this was not a hotly-negotiated point.

24 Q And would you consider HarbourVest's commitment to vote
25 for the plan an important part of the settlement?

Seery - Cross

87

1 A I think it's an important part of the settlement, that the
2 part of the settlement is the subordinated claim. We could
3 put that into presumably any plan. But our plan does -- does
4 have a Class 9 for that. So I think it's a -- it's a part of
5 the settlement that is important or we wouldn't have included
6 it. It clearly wraps everything up and moves us towards
7 confirmation.

8 Q And would you have made the deal with HarbourVest if they
9 had pushed back on the commitment to vote for the plan?

10 A Yeah, I would have.

11 Q All right. Thank you.

12 MR. WILSON: No further questions.

13 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Draper, anything from
14 you?

15 MR. DRAPER: Yes, Your Honor.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. DRAPER:

18 Q Mr. Seery, I may not understand the settlement, and I
19 apologize, but the way I think the settlement reads, the
20 interest that you're acquiring, you have the right to place in
21 any entity. Is that my -- is that correct?

22 A I don't recall the -- the specifics, but just from a
23 structural standpoint, we wanted to be able to put it into a
24 subsidiary as opposed to putting it directly in HCMLP. If we
25 couldn't do that, we would -- we would put it into HCMLP. So

1 there wasn't a -- I don't recall the actual specifics, but we
2 certainly thought about holding that interest in a -- in a
3 subsidiary, just to have a cleaner hold.

4 Q Why aren't you putting it into the Debtor so the Court and
5 the estate have jurisdiction over that?

6 A I think the Court certainly has jurisdiction over an
7 entity that the estate owns a hundred percent of. I don't
8 think that's -- that's even a close call. So the important --

9 Q Now, --

10 A Can I finish?

11 Q Sure.

12 A You asked me why. To the extent that somebody thinks that
13 problematic, I will consent to the Court having complete
14 jurisdiction over it, since I control it a hundred percent.

15 Q No. The real reason is, if I remember correctly, Mr.
16 Dondero and Judge Lynn filed a motion to have some say or some
17 information as to sales by subsidiaries, and I think you took
18 the position that they weren't entitled to it. And so my
19 concern was that putting this in a subsidiary in a sense gave
20 you unfettered control without any review of the item.

21 A I don't -- I don't think that's the case where we --
22 there's a directly-held subsidiary where we own a hundred
23 percent of it. I don't think that that's the case.

24 Q Okay. But you're willing to (a) put this into the Debtor,
25 number one; and number two, have the estate and have the Court

1 have complete control over the disposition of it and its
2 actions, correct?

3 A That's not correct, no.

4 Q What -- what is incorrect about my statement?

5 A The debtor-in-possession has control of its assets. The
6 Court doesn't have complete control over its assets. There's
7 --

8 Q Well, --

9 A -- issues -- hold on a second. This is not -- this is not
10 a game and a trap. We put it in a subsidiary for specific
11 reasons. You asked why. I'm giving you the why. It's not to
12 hide it from anybody. We're not going to sell the asset
13 unless somebody comes up with a great price for it. We're
14 going to monetize the assets. We're going to control HCLOF by
15 a majority.

16 Q But, again, the issue is, if it's in the estate, the Court
17 has supervision over it. If it's not in the estate, the Court
18 has no supervision of it.

19 A I don't think that's correct, because the Court has
20 supervision over the estate, which owns a hundred percent of
21 the special-purpose entity that will own the shares.

22 Q Okay. All right. Now, let's talk about the \$15 million
23 that you discussed and the legal fees that were incurred. Is
24 that the total amount that was spent, or is -- or is that --
25 was the total amount \$30 million and HarbourVest was only

Seery - Cross

90

1 responsible for one half of it or functionally took the brunt
2 of one half of it?

3 A I think the total amount is between \$15 and \$20 million.
4 I don't have the exact numbers.

5 Q So, in fact, the HarbourVest loss due to its ownership
6 would have been one half of that, not \$15 million?

7 A Well, the vehicle lost the money. HarbourVest owned 49.98
8 percent of it, and Highland controlled the rest. So if you
9 allocate it that way, I suppose that would be a -- that's how
10 you would divide it, in -- roughly in half, yes.

11 Q And so HarbourVest's actual dollar loss due to the legal
12 fees is really the 49-point-whatever percent of \$15 million,
13 not \$15 million?

14 A I don't know if -- I certainly would argue that. I don't
15 think that HarbourVest has that position.

16 Q Okay. Now, in connection -- you were asked a question
17 about the documentation that was provided by Highland to
18 HarbourVest both during the bankruptcy of Acis and before.
19 You have control over the Harbour -- over the Highland server,
20 correct?

21 A I'm sorry. Can -- can we do two things? One is, Mr.
22 Draper, I can't see you, so it would be better if I could see
23 you during the questioning.

24 Q Okay.

25 A And could you repeat the question?

1 Q All right. I'll be happy to. You were asked a question
2 about the documentation that was provided by Highland to
3 HarbourVest during the Acis bankruptcy and meetings that took
4 place between the parties. Correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you stated you were unaware of the material that was
7 sent over?

8 A I think I testified that I didn't receive the 40,000
9 documents that were mentioned.

10 Q Did you do any search or order a search of the Highland
11 server to see what material was sent over by any party to
12 HarbourVest to analyze what -- what information they had
13 available to them and what was provided to them?

14 A Yes, we did a search.

15 Q And did you review the documentation that was sent over?

16 A The -- the documentation that we looked at was very
17 specific to the investment and to the OM. So we didn't look
18 for the -- the supposed 40,000 documents, no.

19 Q Did you look for the material that was provided to them
20 during the Acis bankruptcy and the periodic meetings that you
21 discussed? Or that you testified to earlier?

22 A The answer is no.

23 Q One last question. I think, and just so I understand your
24 testimony, you've broken out the HarbourVest claim into two
25 pieces. One is the legal fee amount that we've just

Seery - Cross

92

1 discussed, and I gather the other piece of that is the fraud
2 in the inducement to enter into the CLO purchase?

3 A It's -- it's more -- it's much more than that.

4 Q Okay. Well, let me say it in a different way. The other
5 part of it is the losses as a result of the fraud in the
6 inducement to purchase the interest?

7 A I don't think that's -- that's fair. If I could explain?

8 Q Sure.

9 A Yeah. The legal fee piece is pretty clear. The other
10 piece starts with fraud in the inducement, but it's extensive
11 fraud claims. Fraud in the inducement, as I testified
12 earlier, would get them around the exculpation and liability
13 limitations in the OM. You don't get around all of those with
14 just the fraud. And so that's -- that's the split of that
15 claim. So the fraud in the inducement contains fraud
16 allegations. Even if you didn't have inducement, you'd have
17 other potential fraud claims.

18 Q But let me state it in a different fashion. But for the
19 investment, the fraud that you allege wouldn't have occurred?

20 A I -- HarbourVest alleges it.

21 Q No, I'm just -- in your analysis of the claim, but for the
22 inducement, the rest of the damages wouldn't have flowed?

23 A That's HarbourVest's position, yes. But for the fraud,
24 they wouldn't have made the investment.

25 Q All right.

Seery - Redirect

93

1 MR. DRAPER: I have nothing further for this witness.

2 THE COURT: All right. Any redirect, Mr. Morris?

3 MR. MORRIS: Just a few very questions, Your Honor.

4 Just a very few questions.

5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. MORRIS:

7 Q Mr. Seery, you were asked about that document that Lucy
8 prepared. Do you remember that?

9 A Yes, I do.

10 Q In your experience, don't defendants often deny liability
11 before entering into settlements, or even worse, getting
12 adverse judgments entered against them?

13 A Of course. Yes.

14 Q Okay. And in response to Mr. Draper's questions, isn't
15 the Guernsey claim another claim that the Debtor took into
16 account in assessing the potential risks of this settlement?

17 A There's a number of claims contained in it. As I
18 mentioned earlier, I mentioned the RICO claim. But there is a
19 Guernsey shadow director claim, which is not dissimilar to
20 U.S. claims that somebody effectively controls an enterprise,
21 notwithstanding them not having the official role.

22 Q Okay.

23 MR. MORRIS: I have nothing further, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: All right. Any recross on that redirect?

25 All right.

Seery - Redirect

94

1 MR. WILSON: No, Your Honor.

2 MR. DRAPER: No, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Seery, that concludes
4 your testimony. Thank you.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: We need to take a bathroom break. Before
7 we do, I just want to be clear with what we have left. As I
8 understood it, we were having Mr. Pugatch from HarbourVest.
9 Mr. Morris, will that conclude the Debtor's evidence?
10 (Pause.) Okay. You were on mute, but I think you were saying
11 yes.

12 MR. MORRIS: Sorry. But to be clear, Debevoise is
13 going to be putting their witness on the stand.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. MORRIS: But it's part of the evidence in support
16 of the motion.

17 THE COURT: All right. Do the Objectors have any
18 witnesses today?

19 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, Mr. Dondero intends to
20 examine Mr. Pugatch, but if he's going to be called by his
21 counsel, then we will do that as a cross-examination.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MR. DRAPER: This is Douglas Draper. I have no
24 witnesses.

25 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I'm asking --

1 well, I do want to ask: Can we get a time estimate
2 potentially for Mr. Pugatch?

3 MS. WEISGERBER: For my examination, Your Honor,
4 twenty minutes, perhaps.

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MS. WEISGERBER: Or less.

7 THE COURT: All right. Well, let me tell you what
8 we're going to do. We're going to take a ten-minute bathroom
9 break. But I have a 1:30 hearing and I have a 2:00 o'clock.
10 Well, I have a 1:30 docket, multiple matters, and a 2:00
11 o'clock docket. So, you know, I'm really intending that we
12 get finished in time to give me and my staff a little bit of a
13 lunch break before launching into the 1:30 docket, so I'm
14 hopeful we can get done around 1:00-ish. If we can't, then
15 we're going to have to reconvene, I'm going to say probably
16 3:00-ish Central time. So let's hope we can get through
17 everything. All right? Ten-minute break.

18 THE CLERK: All rise.

19 (A recess ensued from 11:58 a.m. until 12:08 p.m.)

20 THE CLERK: All rise.

21 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. We're
22 going back on the record in the Highland matters. Do we have
23 everyone? It looks like we do. Ms. Weisgerber is going to
24 call the next witness; is that correct?

25 MS. WEISGERBER: Yes, Your Honor. We call Michael

Pugatch - Direct

96

1 Pugatch of HarbourVest to the stand.

2 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pugatch, if you could
3 turn on your video and say, "Testing one, two."

4 MR. PUGATCH: Two.

5 THE COURT: All right. There you are. Please raise
6 your right hand.

7 MICHAEL PUGATCH, HARBOURVEST'S WITNESS, SWORN

8 THE COURT: Thank you. You may proceed.

9 MS. WEISGERBER: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

12 Q Good morning. Can you please state your name for the
13 record?

14 A Sure. It's Michael Pugatch.

15 Q And where do you work, Mr. Pugatch?

16 A HarbourVest Partners.

17 Q And what is your title?

18 A I'm a managing director in our secondary investment
19 group.

20 Q Did HarbourVest file claims in the Highland bankruptcy,
21 Mr. Pugatch?

22 A We did, yes. Several claims, in fact.

23 Q What was the basis for those claims?

24 A Yeah. Among other things, fraudulent inducement based on
25 misrepresentations and omissions on the part of Highland in

1 connection with our original investment, mismanagement at the
2 HCLOF level, including inappropriate fees that were charged
3 to investors, among a number of other items as well.

4 Q Can you explain what you mean by misrepresentations made
5 to HarbourVest by Highland?

6 A Yeah, sure. So, you know, based on a number of
7 statements that were made to us around the litigation
8 involving Mr. Terry, some of the intentions found, the
9 structural changes that came to light with respect to HCLOF
10 and our investment, as well as the fact that the arbitration
11 award specifically against Mr. Terry would have no impact or
12 implication on Highland's sale or business.

13 Q And can you explain what you mean by omissions made by
14 Highland to HarbourVest?

15 A Sure. So I would say, really, the implications behind
16 the structural changes that were made at the time of our
17 investment into HCLOF. Also, the intention, clear intentions
18 that Highland had to never, in fact, pay the arbitration
19 award that came to light during our due diligence period to
20 Mr. -- to Mr. Terry as part of the investment. And
21 ultimately the -- what Highland went about doing in terms of
22 stripping assets of Acis that led to the material value
23 declines and destruction of value that we've experienced
24 since our investment.

25 Q You mentioned a diligence period. Did HarbourVest

1 conduct diligence on the investment?

2 A We did. We conducted very detailed due diligence, as we
3 do for all of our investments. That diligence period lasted
4 several months ahead of our investment decision.

5 Q And did HarbourVest conduct that diligence by itself?

6 A No. So, in addition to internal investment professionals
7 at HarbourVest, we engage with outside advisors, both
8 consultants as well as legal advisors, in connection with
9 that due diligence.

10 Q And did Highland answer all of HarbourVest's questions
11 during that diligence period?

12 A They did. And they were numerous. But yes, they
13 answered all the questions that we had for them.

14 Q Was the Terry dispute part of HarbourVest's diligence?

15 A It was. That came up as one of the outstanding items of
16 litigation as part of our due diligence.

17 Q I'm going to ask my colleague to pull up on the screen an
18 exhibit that was on our exhibit list as Items -- Exhibits 34
19 and 35. It's an August 15, 2017 email from Brad Eden to
20 Dustin Willard. Mr. Pugatch, do you recognize this document?

21 A I do, yes.

22 Q And what is it?

23 A This was an email sent to us during our due diligence
24 period in response to a request for more information on the
25 outstanding litigation that Highland was involved with.

Pugatch - Direct

99

1 MS. WEISGERBER: And if my colleague can just scroll
2 to the attachment to that email.

3 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

4 Q And do you recall the attachment as well, Mr. Pugatch?

5 A Yes, I do.

6 MS. WEISGERBER: And if you can scroll back up to the
7 first email.

8 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

9 Q Who is Dustin Willard?

10 A Yes. Dustin is a colleague of mine at HarbourVest who
11 worked closely with me on this investment.

12 Q And you said that this document was shared with
13 HarbourVest during the diligence period before the HCLOF
14 investment?

15 A It was, correct.

16 Q Is it typical during diligence to receive a description
17 of litigation such as this?

18 A It is. It's a question that we always ask. Certainly a
19 component of our diligence to understand any outstanding
20 litigation on the part of our counterparty or manager that
21 we're investing in.

22 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor, I'd move to offer this
23 exhibit into evidence.

24 THE COURT: Any objection?

25 MR. DRAPER: No objection, Your Honor.

Pugatch - Direct

100

1 MR. MORRIS: No objection from the Debtor, Your
2 Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. What is the letter or number
4 for this exhibit?

5 MS. WEISGERBER: It's HarbourVest Exhibit 34.

6 THE COURT: All right. So HarbourVest Exhibit 34 is
7 admitted.

8 (HarbourVest's Exhibit 34 is received into evidence.)

9 THE COURT: And I need to be clear where it appears
10 on the docket. Can someone tell me?

11 MS. WEISGERBER: So, it's identified on our exhibit
12 list, not -- it's not attached to the exhibits. It is on the
13 docket. We were -- when we initially filed the exhibit list,
14 we were working out confidentiality issues. But it was
15 subsequently filed with our reply last night. It's at Docket
16 No. 1735 --

17 THE COURT: All right.

18 MS. WEISGERBER: -- at Pages A -- Pages A345 to A350.

19 THE COURT: All right. Very well. Thank you.

20 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

21 Q Mr. Pugatch, we'll just scroll down to the second page of
22 the attachment. Can you describe generally what the
23 litigation says regarding the Terry dispute?

24 A Yes. Generally speaking, this dispute was described as
25 an employee dispute, employment agreement dispute, with Mr.

Pugatch - Direct

101

1 Terry, who was a former employee of Highland involved in
2 their CLO business, and is described by Highland to us really
3 having to do with a series of false claims, in their opinion,
4 but having to do with a disgruntled former employee.

5 Q And did it strike you as an unusual or significant
6 dispute?

7 A No. I would say we often -- we'll see, you know, former
8 employees with, you know, claims against a former employer in
9 connection with wrongful termination. I wouldn't say it's
10 extremely common, but certainly not entirely out of the
11 ordinary. And based on the explanations that we'd received
12 from Highland, seemed to be more of an ordinary-course type
13 former employee litigation suit.

14 Q Based on what you now know about the Terry dispute, do
15 you believe that this was an adequate disclosure regarding
16 the dispute?

17 A I would say very clearly not, you know, based on the
18 facts that came to light subsequently, the various rulings in
19 connection with the Acis bankruptcy case. What was very
20 clearly not stated are the actual facts and implications of
21 the ongoing litigation with Mr. Terry.

22 MS. WEISGERBER: I'd ask my colleague to put up the
23 next exhibit. Okay. So, this is on a HarbourVest exhibit
24 list, which is Document No. 1723. It's Exhibit 36 on that.
25 Same issue with respect to initially not filed, but it is on

Pugatch - Direct

102

1 the docket at our response last evening at ECF No. 1735 at
2 Page A351.

3 THE COURT: Page what?

4 MS. WEISGERBER: A351.

5 THE COURT: A351. Thank you.

6 MS. WEISGERBER: You're welcome.

7 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

8 Q Mr. Pugatch, I just put up a November 29, 2017 email from
9 Hunter Covitz to Dustin Willard, Michael Pugatch, and Nick
10 Bellisario. Do you recall this document?

11 A I do, yes.

12 Q And what is this document?

13 A This was an email sent to us by Highland a couple weeks
14 after we closed on our investment on the (inaudible) in
15 response to a *Wall Street Journal* article that had come out
16 regarding Highland, a number of actions that they had taken,
17 and what Highland was articulating to us, a number of false
18 claims that had been made about Highland's prior actions, and
19 specifically trying to explain some of that and also share
20 with HarbourVest a letter that was being sent to the editor
21 of the *Wall Street Journal* highlighting, in their view, some
22 of the inaccuracies around the reporting.

23 Q And did you receive this document?

24 A We did, yes.

25 MS. WEISGERBER: I'd move to offer this, so

Pugatch - Direct

103

1 HarbourVest Exhibit 36, into evidence.

2 THE COURT: Any objections?

3 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, John Wilson. I would object
4 as to the relevance of this document.

5 THE COURT: All right. What's your response?

6 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor, it shows
7 misrepresentations that the witness will testify how it
8 relates back to prior representations prior to HarbourVest's
9 investment, as well as misrepresentations at that time.

10 THE COURT: Okay. I overrule the objection. I'm
11 going to admit it.

12 (HarbourVest's Exhibit 36 is received into evidence.)

13 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

14 Q Mr. Pugatch, can you describe generally -- we spoke about
15 this a little bit -- just what this communication from
16 Highland was conveying to HarbourVest at the time?

17 A Yes. Specifically, again, responding to this *Wall Street*
18 *Journal* article that had been published, trying to defend,
19 again, Highland's own views why there were inaccuracies in
20 the reporting. But importantly, from our perspective, trying
21 to reassure us as to the fact that, you know, these
22 accusations would have no bearing and any results from it
23 would have no bearing on their ongoing business or
24 partnership or the investment that we had made in HCLOF.

25 MS. WEISGERBER: And if you can scroll to the second

Pugatch - Direct

104

1 page.

2 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

3 Q We'll just look at the last paragraph of another email
4 from Mr. Covitz. Can you just read that first sentence of
5 the last paragraph?

6 A Sure. (reading) While the dispute has no impact on our
7 investment activities, as always, we welcome any questions
8 you may have.

9 Q Mr. Pugatch, was this email and the discussion regarding
10 the Terry dispute consistent with the representations made to
11 you prior to HarbourVest's investment into HCLOF?

12 A It was, yes. Both the message, the lack of any impact
13 that ultimately the dispute with Mr. Terry, the arbitration
14 award would have around Highland's ongoing CLO business, or
15 HCLOF specifically, was all, you know, very clear in this
16 document, but all consistent with the representations that
17 had been made to us leading up to our investment in the
18 middle of November 2017 as well.

19 Q Thank you.

20 MS. WEISGERBER: And you can take down the exhibit,
21 Emily. Thank you.

22 BY MS. WEISGERBER:

23 Q You mentioned, Mr. Pugatch, an arbitration award to Mr.
24 Terry. How did you learn about that arbitration award?

25 A That was initially disclosed to us by Highland as we were

Pugatch - Direct

105

1 in the late stages of our diligence and closing process on
2 the investment into HCLOF.

3 Q And generally, what did Highland tell you about the
4 arbitration award?

5 A We were aware of its existence. We were aware of the
6 quantum of the award, I think it was around an \$8 million
7 arbitration award in the favor of Mr. Terry, and that was
8 following the litigation around the wrongful termination and
9 employee dispute that Highland had described to us
10 previously.

11 Q Did you ask to see a copy of the arbitration award?

12 A No, we did not.

13 Q Why not?

14 A Ultimately, we -- you know, the explanations that
15 Highland had provided to us all seemed very reasonable. We
16 relied on their representations that this was, again, nothing
17 more than a dispute with a former disgruntled employee, in
18 their words, that had no bearing or, you know, would not have
19 any bearing on our investment in HCLOF or their ongoing CLO
20 business, which all very clearly was not the case, as
21 we've -- as we've learned over the last several years.

22 Q Following learning about the arbitration award, did
23 HarbourVest do other diligence?

24 A We did. So, in addition to asking questions related to
25 the arbitration award and any impact that it would have, we

Pugatch - Direct

106

1 also spent some time diligencing a couple of structural
2 changes that were proposed by Highland, and, in fact, ended
3 up delaying the closing of our investment by about two weeks
4 as we vetted some of those structural changes that Highland
5 had proposed. Vetted those both, you know, internally with
6 Highland directly and with external counsel in order to make
7 sure that those structural changes were in fact legally sound
8 in ultimately making our investment.

9 Q And were those changes proposed following the arbitration
10 award?

11 A They were, yes.

12 Q Did Highland tell you the reason for the structural
13 changes?

14 A Yeah. So, so some of this -- and specifically, this
15 involved a change of the portfolio manager at the HCLOF level
16 that was really in connection with a rebranding as Highland
17 was going through a rebuild of its CLO business and wanting
18 to align, from a brand perspective, their business on an
19 ongoing basis with the Highland brand as opposed to the Acis
20 brand. But more specifically, in the case of a late change
21 from a structured standpoint, the -- part of the intention
22 and the investment thesis of HCLOF was to pursue a reset, a
23 refinancing of all the underlying CLOs as they approached the
24 end of their investment period or came out of their
25 investment period.

1 And in connection with that, in light of the arbitration
2 award, Highland's view was that there may be difficulties in
3 the market in resetting certain of those Acis CLOs with the
4 Acis brand associated with them, given, again, the existence
5 of the arbitration award and concerns in the market around
6 the Acis brand reputation.

7 Q And what did they tell you was the market view of Acis,
8 or the Acis brand?

9 A Yeah. Their view or their concern was that the, you
10 know, because of the existence of that arbitration award, the
11 brand would be viewed as toxic.

12 Q Didn't this put you on notice that perhaps there was
13 something wrong with the structural changes?

14 A I mean, we -- I mean, short answer, no. We ultimately
15 asked questions, we diligenced the legal structure, but
16 relied on the representations that were made to us by
17 Highland around the rationale for the structural changes,
18 that these are all changes that were within a Highland-
19 managed vehicle or sat below the vehicle that we were
20 investing in, and so ultimately were in Highland's purview,
21 was the representations that we relied on.

22 Q And did HarbourVest alone do that diligence of the
23 structural changes?

24 A So, no. I mean, in connection with the diligence that we
25 did internally and with Highland directly, we engaged with

Pugatch - Direct

108

1 outside counsel who was working with us at the time to vet
2 those structural changes as well.

3 Q Did HarbourVest rely on Highland's representations
4 regarding the arbitration award and the structural changes in
5 making its investment in HCLOF?

6 A We did, absolutely.

7 Q If Highland had disclosed the nature of the structural
8 changes, of removing Acis as the portfolio manager and
9 related transfers, would HarbourVest have proceeded with its
10 investment?

11 A Definitively, no, we would not have.

12 Q Why not?

13 A I think the reality is if we had understood the intent,
14 you know, that Highland was ultimately undertaking here, we
15 would not have wanted to be any part of this, and certainly
16 getting dragged into all of this, the hassle, the value
17 destruction that we've seen on behalf of the investors and
18 the funds that we manage. And I would say, lastly, we just
19 full stop would not have done business with a firm who
20 engages with this type of behavior, had we actually known the
21 truth.

22 Q Mr. Pugatch, are you familiar with the bankruptcy that
23 followed of Acis?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And what was your -- or, did HarbourVest participate in

1 that bankruptcy?

2 A So, initially, no. Subsequently, we ended up getting
3 dragged into that on account of a number of misstatements by
4 Highland about the role that HarbourVest had played as part
5 of our investment into HCLOF and some of that structure and
6 the structural changes that I alluded to.

7 Q How did HarbourVest learn about those misstatements in
8 the bankruptcy about HarbourVest's role?

9 A So, ultimately, those came to light on -- you know, on
10 account of the ongoing proceedings within the Acis bankruptcy
11 process, and specifically brought to light to us by the Acis
12 trustee at the time, who decided to pursue, you know, further
13 diligence or discovery around the claims that Highland had
14 made around HarbourVest's involvement in those changes.

15 Q And what is your understanding of what the allegations
16 were that caused the Acis trustee to investigate HarbourVest?

17 A Sure. So, you know, our understanding was that Highland
18 had made statements, again, false statements that HarbourVest
19 had actually instructed some of those structural changes,
20 that we were the ones that had said that we would not do
21 business with Acis and had ordered some of the underlying
22 transfer of assets or, again, structural changes, that, you
23 know, very clearly I would say were not the case. Also, that
24 HarbourVest was -- was calling the shots as it relates to any
25 of the ongoing management or future resets of the CLOs.

Pugatch - Direct

110

1 Q Did HarbourVest instruct any of those structural changes
2 or transfers to occur?

3 A We did not. Absolutely not.

4 Q Why didn't HarbourVest itself appear in the Acis
5 bankruptcy and file a claim?

6 A Yeah. HarbourVest's role, again, in HCLOF, we were a
7 passive investor in a Highland-managed company. We had no
8 direct interaction with or relationship with Acis. There was
9 really no reason for us to be directly involved until we were
10 subsequently dragged into involvement on account of those
11 misstatements. And then at that point our focus really
12 pivoted to, you know, whether we needed to defend ourselves
13 against those accusations that had been made by Highland and
14 after a request for further information in discovery by the
15 Acis trustee.

16 Q Did HCLOF participate in the Acis bankruptcy?

17 A They did, yes.

18 Q Did HCLOF incur fees for participating in the Acis
19 bankruptcy?

20 A Yes. In fact, very meaningful fees, to the tune of well
21 in excess of \$15 million of legal fees, as we understand it,
22 that have been incurred, largely in connection with the
23 ongoing Acis bankruptcy and Highland's continued pursuit of
24 and in connection with the litigation with Mr. Terry, which
25 we firmly believe was entirely inappropriate that HCLOF and

Pugatch - Direct

111

1 ultimately investors in HCLOF bear those expenses, which were
2 not just expenses of HCLOF but of Highland and a number of
3 other Highland affiliates.

4 Q Do those expenses form a basis of separate claims filed
5 by HarbourVest against Highland?

6 A They do, yes. One of the multiple claims that we had
7 filed against Highland.

8 Q And a few more questions, just for the record, Mr.
9 Pugatch. How much did HarbourVest initially invest in HCLOF?

10 A Sure. So, our initial investment in November of 2017 was
11 right about \$73-1/2 million, I believe.

12 Q Did HarbourVest invest any additional money in HCLOF?

13 A We did. There was a subsequent capital call investment
14 of about \$5 million, bringing our total investment to just
15 under \$80 million in aggregate.

16 Q When HarbourVest initially made the investment, did it
17 anticipate making a profit on it?

18 A We did, yes.

19 Q How much did HarbourVest anticipate earning from the
20 investment?

21 A Yeah. So, our -- based on the original \$73-1/2 million
22 investment, we had expected a total return of about \$137
23 million on that -- on that investment.

24 Q What was that projection based on?

25 A So, that projection was based on materials that we had

Pugatch - Direct

112

1 received from Highland, their internal projection models on
2 the future performance of the underlying CLOs that we were
3 acquiring exposure to through our investment in HCLOF, and
4 was one of the inputs or formed the basis in connection with
5 our diligence that we ultimately ran different sensitivities
6 -- projections around and helped employ -- helped inform our
7 investment thesis.

8 Q Do you know the current value of HarbourVest's investment
9 in HCLOF?

10 A Yes. The current value is right around \$22-1/2 million.

11 Q So roughly how much has the investment itself decreased
12 from HarbourVest's initial investment?

13 A So, net of what was about \$4-1/2 million of distributions
14 that we received early on in the investment, we've lost, to
15 date, in excess of \$50 million on our original investment.

16 Q And just for -- to close out, Mr. Pugatch, knowing all
17 that you know, if HarbourVest had known that -- about the
18 nature of the transfers by Acis or Highland's intent with
19 respect to the arbitration award, would HarbourVest have made
20 this investment?

21 A No. The reality is, had we known the truth, or even had
22 a sense of the truth, the true intentions behind some of
23 those transfers and ultimately what would have happened, we
24 never would have made this investment, full stop.

25 Q Thank you, Mr. Pugatch.

Pugatch - Cross

113

1 THE COURT: All right. I didn't hear you, Ms.
2 Weisgerber. Do you pass the witness?

3 MS. WEISGERBER: Yes, I pass the witness.

4 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

5 Mr. Morris, any examination from you?

6 MR. MORRIS: No, thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 (Interruption.)

9 THE COURT: All right. I'm not sure whose voice that
10 was, but please, again, mute your devices when you're not
11 talking.

12 Any cross-examination of Mr. Pugatch? I'll start with
13 you, Mr. Wilson.

14 MR. WILSON: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. WILSON:

18 Q How are you -- I guess we're afternoon now. How are you
19 this afternoon, Mr. Pugatch?

20 A I'm doing well. Yourself?

21 Q I'm doing well as well. Do you recall that on Monday of
22 this week I took your deposition?

23 A Yes, I do.

24 Q And so you understand that my name is John Wilson and I
25 represent Jim Dondero, who has filed an objection to the 9019

1 motion filed by the Debtor?

2 I've got a few questions for you today. Has HarbourVest
3 been around for over 35 years?

4 A We have, yes.

5 Q And does HarbourVest have ten offices around the world?

6 A Correct, yes.

7 Q And does HarbourVest employ over 150 investment
8 professionals?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Does HarbourVest have over \$74 billion in assets under
11 management?

12 A Correct, yes.

13 Q And is HarbourVest's client base largely comprised of
14 institutional investors?

15 A Also correct.

16 Q And you would agree with me that HarbourVest is a
17 sophisticated investor, right?

18 A I would, yes.

19 Q How long have you worked for HarbourVest?

20 A I've been employed by HarbourVest for 17 years now.

21 Q And how long have you been a managing director?

22 A I've been a managing director for approximately six
23 years.

24 Q And you were, in fact, the managing director for the
25 investment that HarbourVest made in Highland CLO Funding,

1 Ltd., which has been referred to today as HCLOF, correct?

2 A I was, correct.

3 Q And HarbourVest, I think you just testified, invested
4 approximately \$73 million as its initial investment in HCLOF?

5 A Yes, correct.

6 Q And before HarbourVest made that investment, it had made
7 many investments of this type, correct?

8 A Yeah. We've made hundreds of investments into
9 partnerships over our history, correct.

10 Q So HarbourVest was well-experienced in evaluating and
11 deciding whether to invest in large investments, correct?

12 A It was, yes.

13 Q Now, in your -- and by your, I mean HarbourVest -- in the
14 response to the Debtor's omnibus objection, it says that by
15 summer 2017 HarbourVest was engaged in preliminary
16 discussions with Highland regarding the investment. Is that
17 a correct statement?

18 A Correct, yes.

19 Q And, in fact, those talks began in the second quarter of
20 2017, correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And so the investment closed ultimately on November 15th,
23 2017?

24 A Yes, that's correct.

25 Q So it's fair to say that HarbourVest considered and

1 evaluated this transaction for over six months before
2 investing its \$73 million, right?

3 A From the time of the initial conversations that we had
4 with Highland, yes.

5 Q And one of the reasons that it took over six months to
6 complete the investment is that HarbourVest performs due
7 diligence before it makes an investment, correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q And when you're performing due diligence -- well, first
10 off, you would agree with me that that's a common practice
11 amongst sophisticated investors such as HarbourVest, correct?

12 A To perform due diligence?

13 Q Yes.

14 A Yes.

15 Q And describe -- describe what HarbourVest does in a
16 general sense when it performs its due diligence.

17 A Sure. So, we spend time with the manager -- in this
18 case, Highland -- certainly around the investment thesis, the
19 opportunity, receive materials around the underlying assets.
20 We take that and perform our own independent due diligence
21 around the value of those assets, perform due diligence on
22 the manager itself, the go-forward opportunity. In many
23 cases, and certainly in this case, engage with outside
24 advisors to assist with that due diligence. It's a very
25 robust and thorough process.

1 Q And by outside advisors, are you referring to the outside
2 counsel that you testified about earlier?

3 A Yes. Both outside counsel and outside consultants.

4 Q Okay. And so did you say that it's typical to engage
5 outside counsel when performing due diligence?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And which outside counsel did you retain with respect to
8 this due diligence?

9 A Debevoise and Plimpton as well as Milbank.

10 Q And during the course of HarbourVest's due diligence, did
11 it identify some items of concern?

12 A As with any investment, there are always items that are
13 identified that require further diligence, risks that are
14 identified that we look to mitigate through our due
15 diligence, et cetera.

16 Q And if Harbour -- I'm sorry, did you say something else?

17 A No.

18 Q You were finished? Okay. Now, if HarbourVest identifies
19 an item of concern, is it typical to request additional
20 information regarding those items of concern?

21 A It is, yes.

22 Q And so that actually happened with respect to the HCLOF
23 investment, correct?

24 A In certain cases, yes.

25 Q HarbourVest identified several litigation matters that it

1 had questions about, correct?

2 A Correct. As we would with any investment.

3 Q And it went back to Highland and asked them to explain
4 their position on those litigation matters?

5 A Correct.

6 Q And one of those litigation matters was the Joshua Terry
7 litigation, correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And at the time that HarbourVest was considering this
10 investment, beginning in the second quarter and continuing
11 through the summer, that Josh Terry litigation had not
12 resulted in an award or a final judgment, correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q And I think we looked earlier at a document that your
15 counsel admitted as HarbourVest Exhibits 34 and 35. There
16 was an email from a HarbourVest -- or, I'm sorry, from a
17 Highland representative to a HarbourVest representative that
18 was discussing Highland's position on the litigation,
19 including the Terry litigation, correct?

20 A Are you referring to the document that we looked at
21 earlier?

22 Q I am. And I can put it on the screen if we need to.

23 A No. Right, I recall that, and yes, that's correct.

24 Q Okay. And just to be clear, that document, which stated
25 Highland's positions on the -- and summaries of the

1 litigation, was issued months before the arbitration award to
2 Josh Terry, correct?

3 A I don't remember the exact timing, but it was certainly
4 during our due diligence period and prior to the arbitration
5 award, yes.

6 Q Well, it seems to me that that email that you -- your
7 counsel admitted as an exhibit was issued in August of 2017.
8 Does that sound right to you?

9 A If that's what the email said, yes.

10 Q And if the Terry arbitration award came out in October,
11 then you would agree with me that that is several months
12 prior to the -- or at least two months prior to the
13 arbitration award?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And so when HarbourVest made requests of Highland to
16 provide information regarding its items of concern, Highland
17 complied with those requests, correct?

18 A It did, correct.

19 Q And was there ever a time when HarbourVest requested
20 Highland to provide information and that information was not
21 provided?

22 A Our requests for information, or at least, you know,
23 responses or color to a question, were always met either
24 with, you know, written or verbal communication back to us,
25 yeah.

1 Q And you would agree with me that, in fact, HarbourVest
2 delayed the closing of the investment by two weeks to
3 continue its due diligence, correct?

4 A Correct, related to the structural changes that were made
5 close to closing. That's right.

6 Q And after conducting that due diligence, HarbourVest
7 satisfied itself that the investment was sound?

8 A That the legal structure that had been put in place in
9 connection with those proposed changes by Highland was -- was
10 legally sound, yes, and on the back of, again, statements and
11 misrepresentations on the part of Highland around the nature
12 and potential impact to their ongoing CLO business and HCLOF.

13 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm going to object to the latter
14 part of your response as nonresponsive.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 BY MR. WILSON:

17 Q Now, after you conducted the due diligence, HarbourVest
18 made the investment of \$73 million on November 15th, 2017,
19 correct?

20 A Correct.

21 Q And so I think you testified earlier that prior to that
22 investment HarbourVest had become aware that that Josh Terry
23 litigation had resulted in an arbitration award, correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q But I think you've also testified that HarbourVest did

1 not request that Highland provide a copy of the arbitration
2 award, correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q And you further testified that you were represented by
5 outside counsel at the time, correct?

6 A Correct.

7 Q And as of Monday of this week, you had not reviewed that
8 arbitration award; is that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Have you reviewed that arbitration award since Monday of
11 this week?

12 A I have not.

13 Q But in any event, you testified that Highland told you
14 about the award?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And they told you the amount of the award?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then they told you that the award had been converted
19 to a judgment?

20 A When you say the award had been converted to a judgment,
21 can you be more specific?

22 Q Well, I don't know how familiar you are with the
23 litigation process, but in this instance, that award was
24 taken to a court and the court entered a judgment on the
25 arbitration award. Did you -- were you aware of that?

1 A I don't recall the specific legal terms of judgment
2 against it. I was aware of the existence of the arbitration
3 award and the -- and the obligation for Highland to comply
4 with that arbitration award.

5 Q And HarbourVest did not make an appearance in the Acis
6 bankruptcy, right?

7 A We did not.

8 Q But you were aware of the Acis bankruptcy, correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And you were kept apprised of the Acis bankruptcy by
11 Highland individuals, correct?

12 A We had conversations with a couple of Highland
13 individuals throughout the Acis bankruptcy process, yes.

14 Q Right. And in fact, you testified that you participated
15 in regular conference calls with Highland regarding that
16 bankruptcy?

17 A That's correct, yes.

18 Q And do you recall having been provided with over 40,000
19 documents by Highland related to the Acis bankruptcy?

20 A I do not recall that, no.

21 Q Would those documents have been provided to your outside
22 counsel, had you received them?

23 A I don't know the answer to that.

24 Q Did the outside counsel that represented you in the due
25 diligence continue to represent you throughout the Acis

1 bankruptcy?

2 A They did. One of the counsels did, correct.

3 Q And which counsel was that?

4 A Debevoise.

5 Q So was your counsel actively involved with monitoring the
6 Acis bankruptcy?

7 A They were, yes, particularly after we were ultimately
8 accused of having something to do with the original structure
9 and -- as a result of misstatements by Highland.

10 Q Did your counsel attend hearings in the Acis bankruptcy?

11 A I don't recall.

12 Q Are you familiar with the PACER system?

13 A I am not.

14 Q Now, I think that HarbourVest has been described as a
15 passive investor. You recall that description of HarbourVest
16 in this instance?

17 A Yes.

18 Q But, in fact, HarbourVest invested substantial assets
19 such that it owned a 49.98 percent share of HCLOF. Would you
20 agree with that?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q And in fact, the next largest investor was CLO Holdco,
23 which owned 49.02 percent of the shares, correct?

24 A That sounds right.

25 Q And there was an advisory board that was created pursuant

1 to the formation documents of this investment, correct?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q And in fact, that advisory board only had two members,
4 and one was a representative of HarbourVest and one was a
5 representative of CLO Holdco, correct?

6 A Correct.

7 Q And the advisor -- I'm sorry, the portfolio manager was
8 not allowed to disregard the recommendations of the advisory
9 board, correct?

10 A With respect to the limited set of items that the
11 advisory board could opine on, that is correct.

12 Q All right. I want to go over a couple of the
13 misrepresentations that HarbourVest has identified in its
14 filings related to its claim. The first one is -- and just
15 for the record, I'm reading from Docket No. 1057 filed on
16 September 11, 2020, HarbourVest Response to Debtor's First
17 Omnibus Objection.

18 But the first misrepresentation identified in that
19 document says that Highland never informed HarbourVest that
20 Highland had no intention of paying the arbitration award.
21 And was -- was Highland obligated to pay the Josh Terry
22 arbitration award against Acis?

23 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the question to the extent
24 it calls for a legal conclusion.

25 THE COURT: Sustained.

1 MS. WEISGERBER: Join in that objection.

2 THE COURT: Sustained. I think --

3 BY MR. WILSON:

4 Q Your understanding was --

5 MR. WILSON: I'm sorry, Judge?

6 THE COURT: I sustained the objection as calling for
7 a legal conclusion. So, next question.

8 MR. WILSON: Yes, I -- I heard that. Thank you, Your
9 Honor.

10 BY MR. WILSON:

11 Q In your understanding, was Highland responsible for
12 paying the arbitration award to Josh Terry?

13 A My understanding is on the account of the fact that Acis
14 --

15 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection, Your Honor. Objection,
16 Your Honor, same basis.

17 THE COURT: Sustained. It was essentially the same
18 question.

19 MR. WILSON: Well, Your Honor, I didn't ask --

20 THE COURT: It was essentially the same question, Mr.
21 Wilson. Move on.

22 MR. WILSON: Okay.

23 BY MR. WILSON:

24 Q The next misrepresentation identified by HarbourVest said
25 that Highland did not inform HarbourVest that it undertook

1 the transfers to siphon assets away from Acis, LP and that
2 such transfers would prevent Mr. Terry from collecting on the
3 arbitration award. So the basis for that allegation would be
4 that Highland was siphoning assets from Acis to avoid having
5 Acis pay the arbitration award, correct?

6 A That -- that would be the implication, yes.

7 Q Okay. And then that misrepresentation continues on and
8 says that Highland represented to HarbourVest that it was
9 changing the portfolio manager because Acis was toxic. And
10 do you recall that representation being made to you?

11 A Yes, I do.

12 Q And would you agree with me that whether or not Acis is
13 toxic in the industry would be an opinion?

14 A I suppose it would be an opinion, but by the manager of
15 the vehicle responsible for managing the HCLOF investment and
16 the underlying CLOs. Yeah, we viewed the Acis name and the
17 Highland name as synonymous, if you will. I mean, Acis was a
18 subsidiary of Highland. For all intents and purposes, it was
19 the same from our perspective as we made the investment into
20 HCLOF.

21 Q So did HarbourVest have an independent understanding of
22 whether or not the Acis name was toxic in the industry?

23 A We did not, no. We relied on Highland's views of that as
24 manager of HCLOF.

25 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, just a brief housekeeping

Pugatch - Cross

127

1 item. Did you say that we need to be done at 1:00 o'clock?

2 THE COURT: Well, I said I really wanted you to be
3 done by 1:00 o'clock because I have a 1:30 docket and a 2:00
4 o'clock docket and I'd rather not have to hang up 70-
5 something people and reconnect them again at 3:00 o'clock.
6 How close are you to being finished?

7 MR. WILSON: Well, --

8 THE COURT: This is going at a very slow pace.

9 MR. WILSON: Well, I apologize for that, Your Honor.
10 I think I've got at least ten more minutes, but -- but I know
11 we also have closing remarks. And I was just going to ask if
12 Your Honor had a preference of --

13 THE COURT: Keep going.

14 MR. WILSON: -- of breaking now --

15 THE COURT: Keep -- let's --

16 MR. WILSON: -- or keep going? Okay.

17 THE COURT: Let's talk fast and try to get through.
18 You know, even if I'm sacrificing lunch today, I don't want
19 to inconvenience 75 people this way. So we'll just probably
20 start our 1:30 hearing a little late and inconvenience those
21 people.

22 All right. Go ahead.

23 MR. WILSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

24 BY MR. WILSON:

25 Q Did Acis form its -- I can't recall if you answered this

1 question, but did Acis form its own opinion on whether or not
2 -- I'm sorry, strike that. Did HarbourVest form its own
3 opinion on whether or not the Acis name was toxic in the
4 industry?

5 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection, --

6 THE WITNESS: We did not. We didn't have a basis.

7 THE COURT: I'm sorry, did I have an objection?

8 BY MR. WILSON:

9 Q You did not --

10 THE COURT: Did I have an objection?

11 MS. WEISGERBER: Yeah. Objection. Yes. Objection,
12 asked and answered, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Overruled. He can answer.

14 BY MR. WILSON:

15 Q Okay. But --

16 A We did not.

17 Q Did Highland have the ability to investigate the Acis
18 name and make its own determination of whether that name was
19 toxic? I'm sorry, I think I'm misspeaking. HarbourVest.

20 A HarbourVest had the ability to do that, yes.

21 Q I apologize I misspoke. I meant HarbourVest. Did
22 HarbourVest have the ability to investigate that name and
23 determine if it was toxic?

24 A It was irrelevant to our investment thesis. And as I
25 said before, Acis was a subsidiary of Highland. We viewed

1 them as interchangeable in the context of our investment.

2 Q Okay. The next misrepresentation that you refer to says
3 that Highland indicated to HarbourVest that the dispute with
4 Mr. Terry would have no impact on its investment activities.
5 Would you agree with me that that is also an opinion?

6 A It was a statement that --

7 MS. WEISGERBER: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
8 the extent these questions are seeking a legal conclusion
9 regarding, you know, if something's an opinion or not.

10 THE COURT: Okay. Overruled. He can answer.

11 THE WITNESS: It was -- it was a statement that was
12 made to us by Highland and represented in multiple different
13 formats as fact. And a representation that we relied on in
14 connection with our investment.

15 BY MR. WILSON:

16 Q And finally, the misrepresentation, the last
17 misrepresentation identified, is that Highland expressed
18 confidence in the ability of HCLOF to reset or redeem the
19 CLOs. Would you agree with me that that statement is an
20 opinion?

21 A On the basis that it was the core investment thesis of
22 the -- of the investment of HCLOF. Again, whether that's
23 legally viewed as an opinion or a fact, it was -- it was
24 certainly the investment thesis that we made the investment
25 predicated upon.

Pugatch - Cross

130

1 Q And you just testified that you thought that Acis and
2 Highland were interchangeable from the perspective of the
3 investment opportunity, correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q But you also accepted Highland's recommendation because
6 HarbourVest agreed that the change in the -- to a Highland
7 manager made commercial sense, correct?

8 A We took at face value what Highland recommended because
9 this all had to do with the structuring of an entity that
10 they fully managed with respect to multiple underlying
11 subsidiaries that weren't managed by Highland.

12 Q But would you agree that, at the time, you -- HarbourVest
13 thought that made commercial sense?

14 A It did not seem unreasonable to us based on the
15 explanation we were given.

16 Q Okay.

17 MR. WILSON: I want to refer to HarbourVest Exhibit
18 39.

19 (Pause.)

20 THE COURT: What are we waiting on? What are we
21 waiting on?

22 MR. WILSON: I'm trying to get the document on the
23 screen, Your Honor.

24 (Pause.)

25 THE COURT: We can't hear you. We can't hear you.

Pugatch - Cross

131

1 MR. WILSON: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Your Honor. I'm
2 speaking with my --

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 MR. WILSON: -- co-counsel here.

5 THE COURT: All right.

6 (Pause.)

7 MS. WEISGERBER: Mr. Wilson, is it 39 or 38 that
8 you're referring to?

9 MR. WILSON: 39. HarbourVest 9019 motion on the
10 main -- on the Dondero file. And then there's the -- it's --
11 it's John -- and then there's the HarbourVest, and then the
12 exhibits are all in one file.

13 MS. WEISGERBER: Mr. Wilson, I'll just note that 39
14 was subject to confidentiality based on HCLOF's request.
15 HCLOF's counsel is present. I think they know it's an
16 excerpt. But I'd just -- that for HCLOF's counsel.

17 MR. WILSON: Well, is there an objection to showing
18 this document on the screen? Yes. All right. We're not
19 going to put Document 39 on the screen.

20 A VOICE: Yes.

21 MR. WILSON: All right. Scroll down to the next
22 page.

23 BY MR. WILSON:

24 Q This is a -- this is a document that was produced to us
25 this week, the Highland production. It appears to be a

Pugatch - Cross

132

1 Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Statement of Operations for the
2 Year Ended 31 December 2017. Do you see at the top of that --
3 at the top of that document where it says total investment
4 income of \$26 million?

5 A I do, yes.

6 Q And total expenses were roughly \$1.8 million?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And then net change and unrealized depreciation on
9 investments and net realized loss on investments was \$4.26
10 million cumulative, resulting in a net increase in net assets
11 resulting from operations of \$20.224 million. Do you agree
12 with that?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay.

15 MR. WILSON: Go to the next one.

16 BY MR. WILSON:

17 Q And you understand that, in the course of the Acis
18 bankruptcy, the portfolio managers for certain of the CLOs
19 were changed by the Trustee, correct?

20 A Yes, around the underlying CLOs. That's -- that's my
21 understanding, yes.

22 Q And, in fact, Mr. Seery testified earlier today that that
23 occurred in the summer of 2018, correct?

24 MR. WILSON: Scroll.

25 THE WITNESS: I don't recall the timing, but that's

1 what he testified to.

2 BY MR. WILSON:

3 Q Well, this document is HarbourVest Exhibit 40, and this is
4 the statement of operations for the financial year ended 31
5 December 2018. Here, the total investment income is only
6 \$11.1 million. Do you see that?

7 A I do.

8 Q And do you see where the expenses have increased to \$13.6
9 million?

10 A I do, yes.

11 MR. WILSON: Okay. Scroll down some more.

12 BY MR. WILSON:

13 Q And do you see where it says net change and unrealized
14 loss on investments of \$48.47 million?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And so after Acis and Brigade took over the managements of
17 these CLOs, we had a net decrease in net assets resulting from
18 operations of \$52.483 million in the year 2018, correct?

19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection, Your Honor. Assumes a
20 fact not in evidence.

21 THE COURT: Overruled. He --

22 MR. WILSON: Your Honor, --

23 THE COURT: We're just looking at this statement and
24 testifying about it says, so I overrule the objection.

25 MR. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your

Pugatch - Cross

134

1 Honor. I'm now going to turn to HarbourVest Exhibit 41. All
2 right. I'll --

3 BY MR. WILSON:

4 Q Did you answer the question, Mr. Pugatch?

5 A No, I -- I would agree with the second part of your
6 statement that for the year 2018 the -- the loss was \$52
7 million. I don't -- I don't believe that jives with the first
8 part of your statement that that was after Acis and Brigade
9 took over. As I understand, that was in the middle of the
10 year.

11 Q But in any event, Acis and Brigade had been managing this
12 for at least six months of 2018 when that loss occurred,
13 correct?

14 A They had been managing a portion of the underlying CLO
15 portfolio held by Highland CLO Funding.

16 Q All right. We're now looking at Exhibit #41, which is the
17 Draft Unaudited Statement of Comprehensive Income, 31 December
18 2019. Total income has now dropped to \$4.664 million.

19 MR. WILSON: And scroll down.

20 BY MR. WILSON:

21 Q Expenditures are at \$3.645 million. And then it says
22 investment gains and losses net out to \$11.493 million, a
23 negative \$11.493 million. And --

24 MR. WILSON: Scroll down to the --

25 BY MR. WILSON:

1 Q And so would you agree with me that in the year 2019,
2 HCLOF showed a net loss of \$10.476 million?

3 A Yes, that's what the financial statements say.

4 Q And in this year, the Acis CLOs were solely managed by
5 Acis and Brigade, correct?

6 A The Acis CLOs were. Yes, correct.

7 Q All right.

8 MR. WILSON: Now, go to 42.

9 BY MR. WILSON:

10 Q Now, this is HarbourVest #42.

11 MR. WILSON: Go down to the next page.

12 BY MR. WILSON:

13 Q And this is the Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. Unaudited
14 Condensed Statement of Operations for the Financial Period
15 Ended 30 June 2020. And so this is just half a year of
16 operations. And would you -- and this actually has a
17 comparison between 2019 and 2020. But do you see where it
18 says investment income has dropped from a million dollars in
19 the first half of 2019 to \$381,000 in the first half of 2020?

20 A Yes.

21 MR. WILSON: Okay. Scroll down.

22 BY MR. WILSON:

23 Q And do you see where, in the first half of 2019, total
24 expenses were \$1.85 million, and then in the first half of
25 2020 total expenses were \$2.16 million? Do you see that?

Pugatch - Cross

136

1 A I do.

2 Q And if you go down below that, where it says Net Realized
3 and Unrealized Gain/Loss on Investments, the first half of
4 2019 HCLOF lost \$12 million, and in the first half of 2020 it
5 lost \$39.472 million?

6 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, I'm going to object. It's
7 John Morris for the Debtor. I'm happy to stipulate. In fact,
8 he can offer this document into evidence. There's no
9 foundation that Mr. Pugatch has any particularized knowledge
10 about any of the numbers behind this. All he's asking him to
11 do is to confirm what the document says. It says what it
12 says. But this -- I'll object on that basis, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wilson, what about it?
14 You're just getting him to read numbers off of these exhibits.

15 MR. WILSON: Well, --

16 THE COURT: Shall we just --

17 MR. WILSON: -- I understood --

18 THE COURT: -- by stipulation get them into evidence?

19 MR. WILSON: Well, --

20 MR. MORRIS: No objection, Your Honor.

21 MS. WEISGERBER: No objection.

22 THE COURT: All right. So these are exhibits what?
23 We've gone through 39, 41, and I don't know what else. 40,
24 maybe?

25 MR. WILSON: It was Exhibits 39, 40, 41, and 42 that

1 were on the HarbourVest exhibit list.

2 THE COURT: All right. Those will be admitted, and
3 we've already discussed what docket entry number they appear
4 at.

5 (HarbourVest's Exhibits 39 through 42 are received into
6 evidence.)

7 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? You told me
8 you had 10 more minutes about 15 minutes ago.

9 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm sorry if I -- I think I had
10 said I had at least ten more minutes, and I was looking at the
11 -- it was 10:50 [sic] and you wanted to quit at 1:00. So I do
12 have longer than that. I'm sorry, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Well, --

14 MR. WILSON: But --

15 THE COURT: -- I feel like I'm being --

16 MR. WILSON: -- I'll try to proffer --

17 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Wilson, let me just tell you
18 something. I feel like I'm being disrespected now, and the
19 parties are. We really need to pick up the pace. I've told
20 you I've got a 1:30 docket -- with four or five matters on it,
21 by the way. I've got a 2:00 o'clock docket. I'm starting
22 them late. No one advised my courtroom deputy that we were
23 going to need all day today for this, okay? So you've got
24 five more minutes to wrap it up, and then, of course, I have
25 to go to Mr. Draper and see if he has cross. All right? So

Pugatch - Cross

138

1 please don't test my patience any more. Five minutes to
2 finish.

3 MR. DRAPER: Judge, I have no questions.

4 THE COURT: I didn't hear you, Mr. Draper. What did
5 you say?

6 MR. DRAPER: I have no questions.

7 THE COURT: All right. Very good.

8 MR. WILSON: I apologize, Your Honor. I was actually
9 trying to be respectful of your time when I informed you that
10 I had at least ten more minutes left at 12:50, but I will try
11 to be as expedient as I can as I finish up.

12 BY MR. WILSON:

13 Q And I don't see you on my screen.

14 MR. WILSON: You can take that document down.

15 THE WITNESS: Here.

16 BY MR. WILSON:

17 Q Mr. Pugatch, do you have an opinion as to what caused
18 these incredible losses of value at HCLOF?

19 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection to the extent it calls for
20 a legal conclusion.

21 THE COURT: Overruled. He can answer.

22 THE WITNESS: I would say that there's no one cause
23 for the decline in value. I can point to a number of
24 different things, including the exorbitant fees that were
25 charged to HCLOF, including the inability to be able to re --

1 refinance the CLOs on the part of HCLOF, all of which stems
2 from the actions that Highland took prior to our investment in
3 HCLOF.

4 BY MR. WILSON:

5 Q And you've -- I think it's been referenced several times
6 in HarbourVest's arguments that -- that the reset was a
7 fundamental -- the inability to get a reset was a fundamental
8 cause of the loss in value. Is that -- is that HarbourVest's
9 position?

10 A That -- that is a part of the -- the cause in the
11 declining value of the CLOs, yes.

12 Q And you would agree with me that a reset is fundamentally
13 a reset of interest rates, correct?

14 A Of the interest rates of the liabilities of the -- the
15 timing for repayment of those liabilities, yes.

16 Q Now, just say with -- for the sake of a hypothetical
17 example. If you had a home that was valued at \$5 million, or
18 let's just say \$500,000, let's make it more realistic. If you
19 had a \$500,000 home and you had a mortgage on that home at
20 five percent interest, your inability to refinance that home
21 at a lower interest rate would not affect the underlying value
22 of that home, correct?

23 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection, Your Honor. Hypothetical.
24 And objection to relevance as well.

25 THE COURT: Sustained.

Pugatch - Cross

140

1 MS. WEISGERBER: Calls for speculation.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 BY MR. WILSON:

4 Q Is there any reason to believe that the change in the
5 interest rate would have prevented the massive losses of
6 investment value that occurred in HCLOF?

7 MS. WEISGERBER: Object on the same grounds.

8 THE COURT: Sustained.

9 THE WITNESS: The short -- the short answer is yes,
10 with a -- with the amount of leverage --

11 MS. WEISGERBER: I --

12 THE WITNESS: -- that exists. Oh, sorry.

13 MS. WEISGERBER: The objection was sustained.

14 THE COURT: Yeah, I sustained the objection. That
15 means you don't answer.

16 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

17 BY MR. WILSON:

18 Q So, would you agree with me that if the expenses and the
19 fees charged by the portfolio manager increased dramatically,
20 that would -- that would impact the value of the investment,
21 correct?

22 MS. WEISGERBER: Objection on the same grounds, and
23 relevance. This is a 9019 hearing, Your Honor. We are not
24 here to try every minutia. And in fact, we're trying to avoid
25 a trial on the merits. And it feels like we're getting a bit

Pugatch - Cross

141

1 far afield now.

2 THE COURT: I sustain.

3 MR. WILSON: All right. I'll pass the witness.

4 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Draper said he had no
5 cross. So, any redirect, Ms. Weisgerber?

6 MS. WEISGERBER: No, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morris, did you have any
8 redirect?

9 MR. MORRIS: I do not, Your Honor. I have a very
10 brief closing and then some additional remarks if -- if we
11 finish.

12 THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Pugatch, that
13 concludes your testimony. Thank you. You're excused if you
14 want to be.

15 All right. So, as I understood it, there would be no more
16 evidence after this.

17 MR. WILSON: Well, Your Honor, along those lines, as
18 a housekeeping measure, I think everything on my exhibit list
19 is included on someone else's exhibit list, but just for belt
20 and suspenders I would move to admit all of the exhibits on
21 the -- on Mr. Dondero's exhibit list.

22 THE COURT: Well, is that agreed or not? Because we
23 didn't have a witness to get them in.

24 MR. MORRIS: No objection, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Any objection? All right. If there's no

1 objection, I'll --

2 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, --

3 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Was there an objection? I
4 will admit Dondero Exhibits A through M, and those appear at
5 Docket Entry 1721, correct, Mr. Wilson?

6 MR. WILSON: That is correct, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right.

8 MR. WILSON: That is correct, Your Honor.

9 (James Dondero's Exhibits A through M are received into
10 evidence.)

11 MR. WILSON: And one final matter is, during the
12 examination of Mr. Seery, you at least partially admitted
13 Dondero's Exhibit N, and I was wondering if we need to -- how
14 we'd need to submit that for the record.

15 THE COURT: Okay. First, I'm confused. I think you
16 said Mr. Terry's testimony. You --

17 MR. WILSON: I said Seery. I'm sorry.

18 THE COURT: Oh, Seery?

19 MR. WILSON: Or I may have said Terry, but I meant to
20 say Seery.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Maybe you said it. Okay. During
22 Mr. Seery's testimony -- oh, the email that I admitted a
23 portion of?

24 MR. WILSON: That is -- that's correct, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: What -- what are you asking? It's not in

1 your notebook. Are you asking do you need to separately
2 submit it or what?

3 MR. WILSON: Yeah, I was just asking what the Court's
4 preference on how we submit that for the -- put it in the
5 record.

6 THE COURT: Okay. That was so garbled I didn't hear
7 you. You need to file that on the docket as a supplemental
8 exhibit that was admitted, okay?

9 MR. WILSON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Closing arguments? Mr.
11 Morris?

12 CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEBTOR

13 MR. MORRIS: Yes, very briefly, Your Honor. The
14 Debtor easily meets the standard here. The settlement
15 consideration relative to the claim establishes and reflects
16 the likelihood of success on the merits.

17 You know, I've never -- I did hear Mr. Pugatch in the
18 deposition the other day, but I otherwise haven't heard from
19 him. I found him to be incredibly credible, Your Honor, and I
20 regret the fact that he and HarbourVest are being blamed twice
21 here. The fact that they got 40,000 documents or didn't read
22 the arbitration award, it's just -- it's a shame that they're
23 being dragged through this yet again.

24 The fact is, Your Honor, there is no evidence that they
25 made the disclosures that HarbourVest claims -- complains

1 about. They just don't. The fraudulent transfers led to the
2 bankruptcy, led to the appointment of a trustee, led to --
3 right? So, so it's -- that's why -- but they're getting
4 something for their claim.

5 It was a hard negotiation, Your Honor. There is no
6 dispute that if we litigated this it would be complex. It
7 would fact-intensive. The Debtor would be forced to rely upon
8 witnesses who are no longer employed by it. That it would be
9 expensive, for sure. There's no dispute about any of that.
10 There's no dispute that the creditor body has spoken loudly
11 here by unanimously refraining from objecting except for Mr.
12 Dondero and the entities controlled by him.

13 And you heard Mr. Seery's testimony. I think he
14 exhaustively informed the Court as to the process by which the
15 transaction was analyzed and negotiated, and there's no
16 evidence to the contrary that this was an arm's-length
17 negotiation.

18 Unless Your Honor has any questions, we would request that
19 the motion be granted.

20 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Weisgerber, your closing
21 argument?

22 CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF HARBOURVEST

23 MS. WEISGERBER: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. I'll
24 also be brief. We again join in Mr. Morris's arguments and
25 comments.

1 The Court has now heard testimony from Mr. Pugatch
2 regarding the factual detail underlying HarbourVest's claims.
3 The Court has also heard about the significant damages that
4 HarbourVest stands to recover for those claims. And
5 HarbourVest came to this Court ready to litigate. It would --
6 it's ready to do so if needed. It believes it would prevail
7 on its claims if it had to do so.

8 But the Court also heard from Mr. Seery about his
9 understanding of HarbourVest's claims, his calculus, and his
10 decision to settle them. And we submit that nothing further
11 is needed by this Court in order to approve the settlement.
12 This is a question of the Debtor's business judgment. We're
13 not here to have a trial on the merits of HarbourVest's
14 claims. The Objectors have made various arguments, including
15 about the cause of HarbourVest's damages. But even the nature
16 of the legal claims that HarbourVest is asserting, some do not
17 require a loss causation. So we submit that's not even
18 relevant to the merits of the claims.

19 The settlement is clearly in the best interest of the
20 estate, and we respectfully request that the Court approve it.

21 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Mr. Wilson, your
22 closing argument?

23 MR. LYNN: Michael Lynn. I will give the closing
24 argument, if that's satisfactory to the Court.

25 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

1 CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF JAMES DONDERO

2 MR. LYNN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I just want
3 to make a few points, and I'll try to do it as quickly as
4 possible.

5 First, I feel compelled to address the argument of the
6 Debtor that Mr. Dondero is repeating his litigious behavior
7 from the Acis case. I don't know about the Acis case. I
8 wasn't involved except very, very peripherally. But with
9 respect to this case, we have only taken positions in court
10 that we believed -- that is, his lawyers -- believed were
11 warranted by law, facts as we knew them, and that are
12 consistent with professionalism. I'd be glad to explain any
13 position we took.

14 Often, through the Debtor's very persuasive powers, we
15 never had the chance to explain our position previously to the
16 Court. In fact, for the most part, as today, we have been
17 reactive rather than commencing proceedings. In fact, during
18 the first seven months of this case, we only appeared in court
19 a few times, when we felt we had to -- for example, when
20 discovery was being sought by the Creditors' Committee that we
21 feared might invade privilege. Then, much to the Debtor's
22 fury, we opposed the Acis 9019. We did so because we thought
23 it was too much.

24 Since, as the Court can see, the principal instigators of
25 litigation have been the Debtor, and to a lesser extent, the

1 Committee.

2 Indeed, in an apparent effort to drown Mr. Dondero and his
3 counsel in litigation, the Debtor has repeatedly sought court
4 action on a very short fuse, claiming need for expedited
5 hearing.

6 Perhaps the most startling example of this is the recent
7 contempt motion, for which there is no good reason for a quick
8 hearing. Resolution of that motion is not necessary to reach
9 the confirmation hearing. The motion could be heard after the
10 confirmation hearing. There is no need to put Mr. Dondero and
11 his professionals in a position where they have to respond in
12 a couple of days, two business days, and then will have two
13 days to prepare for trial.

14 Second, Your Honor, Mr. Seery has repeatedly asserted,
15 contrary to today's motion, that the HarbourVest claim was of
16 no merit. That is why, when he came in to settle for tens of
17 millions of dollars, we opposed this motion. It appears that
18 the motion is occurring without any cross-party discovery.
19 There is no consideration, apparently, of trying dispositive
20 -- dispositive motions first. There is no consideration for
21 junior classes of equity, which Mr. Seery has previously
22 opined were in the money. This, even though there's no reason
23 that this settlement is necessary pre-confirmation, unless Mr.
24 Seery wants HarbourVest's vote.

25 Third, for whatever reason, that seems to be the driving

1 factor for settling. On its face, the vote seems to be a key
2 factor of the settlement. About the longest provision of the
3 settlement agreement relates to voting. The motion itself --
4 in the motion itself, five of seven bullet points cited by the
5 Debtor for approval of the settlement deal with and emphasize
6 support of the plan or the vote that is to be cast for the
7 plan.

8 If the settlement is a good deal, it didn't need to have
9 as one of its parts the requirement that HarbourVest vote for
10 the plan.

11 Your Honor, I'll stop there. I know Your Honor would like
12 to get just a few minutes before your 1:30 docket. I've been
13 there and I understand that, and I do apologize for taking the
14 time we have, but I think that responsibility is shared with
15 the Debtor and HarbourVest.

16 Thank you, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for that.

18 Mr. Draper, any closing argument from you?

19 CLOSING ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF GET GOOD AND DUGABOY TRUSTS

20 MR. DRAPER: Yes, I have three comments. The first
21 is the claim -- the loss claim, absent the fraud claim, is, at
22 best, \$7 million. I think Mr. Seery's argument that a hundred
23 -- one hundred percent is attributable to there is just wrong.
24 If he and I both invested in a company 50-50 and it goes
25 broke, we only lost 50 cents each.

1 Number two, I think the Court heard the evidence. I think
2 this is, at best, a subordinated claim under 5 -- under the
3 Bankruptcy Code. It's really a "But for the
4 misrepresentations, we wouldn't have invested."

5 And the last one is the -- Judge Lynn represented the
6 voting, so I won't deal with that. But the one that troubles
7 me the most is the fact that this asset that is ultimately
8 being paid for in claim dollars that's being transferred over
9 to the Debtor and being put it outside the estate, outside the
10 purview of this Court, and placed in some subsidiary, this --
11 this transaction, if it is approved, must -- should contain a
12 provision that the asset that's being acquired come into the
13 Debtor and be owned by the Debtor.

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 MR. DRAPER: I have nothing further, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Draper.

17 Mr. Morris, you get the last word since it's your motion.

18 MR. MORRIS: Very quickly, Your Honor. The
19 subordination argument doesn't hold water. This is not a
20 claim against the Debtor for the security; it's a claim for
21 fraud. Okay? So, so 510(b), if it was a claim against HCLOF,
22 that might make sense, but this is a claim against the Debtor.
23 And it's a Debtor -- it's a claim for fraud. That's number
24 one.

25 Number two, we need to keep this exactly as it's been

1 structured in order to avoid litigation. Mr. Seery told the
2 Court. I'm sure the Court can make its own assessment as to
3 Mr. Seery's credibility as to whether or not the Debtor is
4 intending to somehow get this asset beyond the Court.

5 But there are reasons why we've done this, Your Honor.
6 They could have made an objection on that basis. In fact, if
7 they did, it would be overruled, because there's no -- there's
8 no basis for this Court to find that somehow the Debtor and
9 Mr. Seery are doing something untoward to get assets away from
10 this Court's jurisdiction.

11 You know, I don't know what to say about Mr. Lynn's
12 commentary. Much of it had nothing to do with any evidence in
13 the record.

14 The fact remains, Your Honor, that this settlement is
15 fair. It's reasonable. It's in the best interest of the
16 estate. And we would respectfully request that the Court
17 grant the motion.

18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Well, I
19 appreciate all the arguments and evidence I have heard today.
20 I'm going to be brief in my ruling here, but I reserve the
21 right to supplement in a more fulsome written order, which I'm
22 going to instruct Mr. Morris to submit. I am approving the
23 motion to compromise the HarbourVest claim today, and I guess
24 subsumed in that is granting the motion to allow their claim
25 for 3018 voting purposes.

1 I in all ways find this compromise to meet the required
2 legal standard set forth in such cases as *TMT Trailer Ferry*,
3 *AWECO*, and *Foster Mortgage*, numerous other Fifth Circuit
4 cases.

5 First, I'm going to specifically say for the record that I
6 found both witnesses today, Mr. Seery and Mr. Pugatch, to be
7 very credible. Very credible testimony and meaningful
8 testimony was provided to the Court today. And based on that
9 testimony, I find, first, that this compromise was the product
10 of arm's-length negotiations. It was a hard-fought
11 negotiation, as far as I'm concerned. The Debtor objected to
12 these numerous HarbourVest proofs of claim. The Debtor did
13 not want to allow HarbourVest a significant claim for voting
14 purposes. I duly note the statements made in the disclosure
15 statement before this compromise was reached suggesting, you
16 know, the Debtor didn't think HarbourVest should have a large
17 claim.

18 That is consistent with everything I typically see in a
19 bankruptcy case when there's a claim objection. The objector
20 vehemently denies the claimant should have a proof of claim,
21 and then people sit down and think about the risks and rewards
22 of litigating things. And I believe very fervently that's
23 what happened here. There were good-faith, arm's-length
24 negotiations that resulted in this proposed compromise.

25 I find the compromise -- and I'll add to that point, on

1 the good-faith point, I find nothing sinister or improper
2 about the fact that the compromise includes a commitment of
3 HarbourVest to vote in favor of the plan. Again, we see this
4 a lot. You know, there's even a buzz word that doesn't even
5 exist in the Bankruptcy Code: "plan support agreement." You
6 know, we see those a lot -- you know, oftentimes negotiated
7 before the case, but sometimes after. You know, it may be
8 improper in certain situations, but there was nothing here
9 that troubles me about that component of the compromise.

10 I find the compromise to meet the paramount interest of
11 creditors here. Notably, we have very large creditors in this
12 case who have not objected. The *Foster Mortgage* case from the
13 Fifth Circuit tells me I am supposed to consider support or
14 opposition of creditors. No opposition of UBS. No opposition
15 of the Redeemer Committee Crusader Fund. No opposition from
16 Josh Terry or Acis. No opposition from Daugherty.

17 But moreover, when considering the paramount interest of
18 creditors, I find this compromise to be in all ways fair and
19 equitable and in the best interest of the estate, and
20 certainly within the range of reasonableness. The evidence
21 showed that HarbourVest asserted over \$300 million. Over \$300
22 million. Granted, that was based on all kinds of legal
23 theories that would be contested and expensive to litigate,
24 but the evidence also showed that they invested over \$70
25 million. You know, close to \$75 million. I forget the exact

1 number. \$75 or \$80 million, somewhere in that range. And now
2 the credible evidence is that investment is worth about \$22
3 million.

4 So, certainly, while the claim may not have, at the
5 ultimate end of the day in litigation, resulted in a \$300
6 million proof of claim, certainly, certainly there were strong
7 arguments for a very sizeable claim, more than this compromise
8 amount. So it's certainly fair and equitable and reasonable
9 when considering the complexity and duration of further
10 litigation, the risks and rewards, the expense, delay, and
11 likely success.

12 A couple of last things I'm going to say are these. I
13 understand, you know, there is vehement disagreement on the
14 part of our Objectors to the notion that Highland might have
15 caused a \$50 million loss to HarbourVest. But I will tell
16 you, for what it's worth -- I want the record clear that this
17 is part of my evaluation of the reasonableness of the
18 settlement -- my reaction is that, indeed, Highland's
19 litigation strategy in the Acis case caused HCLOF to lose a
20 huge portion of its value, to the detriment of HarbourVest.
21 You know, whether all evidence at the end of the day would
22 convince me of that, I don't know, but that's -- that is
23 definitely this judge's impression.

24 I'm very sympathetic to HarbourVest. It appears in all
25 ways from the record, not just the record before me today, but

1 the record in the Acis case that I presided over, that
2 Highland back then would have rather spent HarbourVest's
3 investment for HCLOF legal fees than let Josh Terry get paid
4 on his judgment. They were perfectly happy to direct the
5 spending of other people's money, is what the record suggested
6 to me.

7 And then, you know, I have alluded to this very recently,
8 as recently as last Friday: I can still remember Mr.
9 Ellington sitting on the witness stand over here to my left
10 and telling the Court, telling the parties under oath, that
11 HarbourVest -- he didn't use its name back then, okay? For
12 the first phase of the Acis case, or most of the Acis case, we
13 were told it was an investor from Boston. And at some point
14 someone even said their name begins with H. I mean, it seemed
15 almost humorous. But Mr. Ellington said it was they,
16 HarbourVest, the undisclosed investor, who was insistent that
17 the Acis name was toxic, and so that's what all of this had
18 been about: the rebranding, the wanting to extract or move
19 things away from Acis.

20 So, you know, I have heard for the -- well, at least the
21 second time today, from Mr. Pugatch, what I perceive to be
22 very credible testimony that that's just not the way it
23 happened.

24 And I guess the last thing I want to say here today, and
25 you know, I guess I have multiple reasons for saying this, not

1 just in connection with approving the settlement, you know,
2 I've heard about how the Acis CLOs, the HCLOF CLOs have lost,
3 you know, a crazy amount of value, that they underperform in
4 the market, that, you know, during the Acis/Brigade tenure
5 and, you know, they should have been reset. You know, I hope
6 those who have not been around as long as some of us in this
7 whole saga know that the -- Mr. Terry, Mr. Phelan, I think
8 Brigade, they all desperately wanted to reset these things,
9 but it was HCLOF, I believe directed by Highland, that wanted
10 to redeem, wanted to liquidate, take the pot of money,
11 warehouse it, and then do their own thing.

12 And there was, I think, from my vantage point, a
13 monumental effort to try to get everyone to the table to do
14 reasonable resets that would be good for the stakeholders at
15 HCLOF and be good for the creditors of Acis, including Josh
16 Terry. That was always the balancing act that most of us were
17 focused on during the Acis bankruptcy. But Highland, I
18 believe, directing HCLOF's strategy, just did not want the
19 resets to happen.

20 So, again, part of me, I suppose, just wants to make the
21 record clear on something that I fear not everyone is clear
22 about. And I say that because the comment was made that the
23 injunctions, the preliminary injunctions sought by the Acis
24 trustee caused the plummet in value, and I think that's just
25 not an accurate statement. I think litigation strategies are

1 what caused the plummet in value, and that's why I think
2 ultimately HarbourVest would potentially have a meritorious
3 claim here in a significant amount if this litigation were to
4 go forward.

5 So, I approve this under 9019. And again, Mr. Morris,
6 you'll upload an order.

7 It is now 1:41, so let's as quickly as possible hear the
8 other motion that I don't think had any objections. Mr.
9 Morris?

10 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, just -- yes, just very
11 quickly, just four things.

12 With respect to the order, I just want to make it clear
13 that we are going to include a provision that specifically
14 authorizes the Debtor to engage in -- to receive from
15 HarbourVest the asset, you know, the HCLOF interest, and that
16 that's consistent with its obligations under the agreement.

17 The objection has been withdrawn, I think the evidence is
18 what it is, and we want to make sure that nobody thinks that
19 they're going to go to a different court somehow to challenge
20 the transfer. So I just want to put the Court on notice and
21 everybody on notice that we are going to put in a specific
22 finding as to that.

23 THE COURT: All right. Fair --

24 MR. MORRIS: Number two is --

25 THE COURT: Fair enough. I do specifically approve

1 that mechanism and find it is appropriate and supported by the
2 underlying agreements.

3 And just so you know, I spent some time noodling this
4 yesterday before I knew it was going to be settled, so I'm not
5 just casually doing that. I think it's fine.

6 Okay. Next?

7 MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much, Your Honor. Number
8 two, with respect to the motion to pay, there is no objection.
9 If we can just submit an order. Or if Your Honor has other
10 guidance for us, we're happy to take it.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone have anything they
12 want to say about that motion?

13 Again, I looked at it. I didn't see any objections. I
14 didn't see any problem with it. It's -- you know, you're
15 going through this exercise because of the earlier protocol
16 order.

17 MR. MORRIS: Correct.

18 THE COURT: All right. Well, if there's nothing,
19 then, I will approve that, finding there is good cause to
20 grant that motion.

21 MR. MORRIS: Okay.

22 THE COURT: All right. Is the only other
23 housekeeping matter --

24 MR. MORRIS: I --

25 THE COURT: -- we have the contempt motion?

1 MR. MORRIS: It is, and I do -- I do have to point
2 out how troubled the Debtor is to learn that Mr. Dondero was
3 still receiving documents from Highland as late as this
4 morning. It's got to be a violation of both the TRO -- I
5 guess it's now the preliminary injunction.

6 I would respectfully request -- I know that time is what
7 it is -- but maybe Mr. Dondero can answer now where he got the
8 document, who he got the document from, what other documents
9 he's gotten from the Debtor since Your Honor ordered him not
10 to communicate with the Debtor's employees.

11 This is not saying hello in the hallway. I mean, this is
12 just -- it is really troubling, Your Honor, and it's why we
13 need the contempt motion heard as soon as possible.

14 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Wilson, do you want to address
15 that? I think the words I heard were that you just got the
16 document this morning, and you got it from Mr. Dondero, but we
17 don't know where and when Mr. Dondero got it. Mr. Wilson, are
18 you there?

19 MR. LYNN: I'm afraid I'm back, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. LYNN: I am not sure whether Mr. Dondero had it
22 in his files from some -- from back before he was asked not to
23 communicate with members or with employees of the Debtor. I
24 believe -- I believe he's with us, though I don't think he's
25 available by video.

1 Are you there, Mr. Dondero?

2 THE COURT: We can't hear you, Mr. Dondero.

3 MR. DONDERO: Judge?

4 THE COURT: Oh, go ahead.

5 MR. DONDERO: Can you hear me now?

6 THE COURT: Yes.

7 MR. DONDERO: Yes, I -- I -- when I moved offices, I
8 found it in a stack of paper, and --

9 MR. LYNN: I understand it shows that his microphone
10 is working.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

12 MR. DONDERO: Can you hear me?

13 THE COURT: Yes, go ahead.

14 MR. DONDERO: Yeah, I -- I'm sitting in new offices.
15 I've got everything in boxes. I was going through everything
16 yesterday, and I found those emails in a stack of papers and I
17 sent them over because I thought they would be relevant
18 relative to Seery's initial impression.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's talk about the timing
20 of this hearing. Mr. Morris, I'm going to -- I'm going to ask
21 you why --

22 MR. LYNN: Michael Lynn, Your Honor. I don't want to
23 waste the Court's time. We have not made available anything
24 to the Court objecting to the expedited hearing on the
25 contempt motion. We've been here.

1 I would say to Your Honor that if Mr. Dondero is indeed in
2 contempt, or was in contempt toward the motion, which has
3 nothing to do with the document that was presented as Dondero
4 Exhibit N, there is no need to hear this on an expedited
5 basis.

6 Every time we turn around, Your Honor, the Debtor is
7 asking that something be heard on an expedited basis. And we
8 have not opposed that. We have not fought that, to speak of,
9 to date. But this is getting a little ridiculous. We're
10 within days of confirmation of the Debtor's plan, and it is
11 simply a means of causing pain and suffering to Mr. Dondero
12 and those who are working with him and for him. And he does
13 have employees at NexPoint who are assisting him.

14 So we most strongly object to being put on a schedule
15 where we are expected to get a response to the contempt motion
16 on file by Monday, today being Thursday, and a weekend
17 intervening. And we strongly object to any setting of this
18 contempt motion on Tuesday or Wednesday. It is absurd, and it
19 is done solely, solely, Your Honor, to cause pain.

20 THE COURT: All right.

21 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, if I may?

22 THE COURT: Please.

23 MR. MORRIS: Just very briefly, we had a hearing the
24 other day. The evidence is the exact same. The evidence is
25 crystal clear that the violations are meaningful, they're

1 substantial, and they are repeated.

2 After the TRO was entered into, Mr. Dondero and only Mr.
3 Dondero chose to interfere with the Debtor's business. Mr.
4 Dondero and only Mr. Dondero chose to communicate with the
5 Debtor's employees, not about saying hello in the hallway but
6 about coordinating a legal defense strategy against the
7 Debtor.

8 The need is immediate, Your Honor, and I would
9 respectfully request that the hearing be set for Tuesday or
10 Wednesday. They've had this motion now since the 7th of
11 January. They had a full evidentiary hearing, so they know
12 most of the evidence that's going to be presented. They have
13 a whole team of -- they have an army of lawyers, Your Honor,
14 and half a dozen firms working on behalf of Mr. Dondero and
15 his interests. For him to cry here, for him to cry that this
16 is too much is really -- it's obscene. It just is.

17 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to say a couple --

18 MR. LYNN: That is absurd.

19 THE COURT: I'm going to say a couple of things. One
20 is that I -- well, the one time I remember getting reversed
21 for holding someone in contempt of court, the District Court
22 felt like I had not given enough notice of that. The District
23 Courts, what they think is reasonable notice, is sometimes
24 very different from what the bankruptcy judges think. We're
25 used to going very lickety-split fast in the bankruptcy

1 courts. And the Courts of Appeals, District Court, Courts of
2 Appeals obviously, for good reason, are very concerned about
3 due process in this kind of context. So I'm sensitive to
4 that.

5 I'm also sensitive to the fact that it is monetary damages
6 that are being sought here to purge the contempt. Okay? The
7 shifting of attorneys' fees is basically what I understand is
8 being sought at this point. You know, we have a preliminary
9 injunction halting behavior at this point, and so I think
10 that's another reason I'm hesitant to give an emergency
11 hearing. I feel like monetary damages can wait and we can
12 give 21-plus days' notice of the hearing.

13 But I'm going to throw this out there as well. If I do
14 feel like there is a showing of contempt, if I do feel like
15 the phone -- as I told you the other day, I'm very, very
16 fixated on the phone that may have been destroyed or thrown
17 away, maybe at Mr. Dondero's suggestion. I mean, the
18 potential monetary sanction here may be very, very large if
19 the evidence plays out in the way I fear it might play out.
20 So I need to make sure everybody has adequate time to prepare
21 for that hearing and make sure I get all the evidence I need
22 to see. All right? Contempt of court is very, very, very,
23 very serious, and I don't think anyone would deny that.

24 So, with that, it was filed what day? January 4th? Is
25 that what I heard? Or --

1 MR. MORRIS: January 7th, I believe, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: January 7th? All right. Well, Traci,
3 are you there? Hopefully, you're not in a hunger coma at this
4 point.

5 THE CLERK: I am here.

6 THE COURT: Okay. We have -- we're going to have to
7 go to that first week of February, right? Because we've got
8 the confirmation hearing that, you know, late in January, and
9 then --

10 THE CLERK: Yes. Uh-huh.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have an available date to
12 give right now?

13 THE CLERK: How about -- if you're willing to hear
14 them on Friday, February 5th.

15 THE COURT: Okay. I can do that. February 5th at
16 9:30. Any -- anybody want to argue about that?

17 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. That's
18 acceptable to the Debtor.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lynn, is that good with you?

20 MR. LYNN: We'll do that, Your Honor. I would say,
21 by the way, that I'll be happy to buy Mr. Seery, out of my own
22 pocket, five cell phones, which ought to make up for the one
23 that was lost, though I recognize that those cell phones will
24 not have on them the privileged information, the conversations
25 between his lawyers and Mr. Dondero that I imagine he was

1 looking forward to seeing.

2 THE COURT: Well, I wouldn't want him to see that
3 information, but I do think he's entitled to any nonprivileged
4 information, texting, or calls that are on that phone. So,
5 again, I'm either going to hear good explanations for that or
6 not, but it's something very concerning to me.

7 All right. So we have a game plan.

8 I'm going to ask, Did we have good-faith negotiations
9 between Dondero and the Committee and anything positive to
10 report? I'll ask Mr. Lynn and Mr. Clemente to weigh in.

11 MR. CLEMENTE: Yes, Your Honor. I'll go first, Your
12 Honor. Mr. Lynn and I have exchanged several emails over the
13 weekend, and the message that I sent to Mr. Lynn was very
14 clear. There had been a term sheet that Mr. Seery had sent
15 back to Mr. Dondero. I had asked Mr. Lynn to take a pencil
16 out and be very specific as to what it was Mr. Dondero was
17 prepared to do in connection with the pot plan. I instructed
18 him that some of the issues that the Committee still has is
19 obviously the overall value, along with the concept that's
20 signing up to a promise from Mr. Dondero to comply with
21 (indiscernible) as part of that value. As Your Honor may
22 understand, the Committee is obviously very skeptical of Mr.
23 Dondero's future performance under an agreement that he enters
24 into.

25 Those are but a couple of issues, Your Honor, that I

1 advised Mr. Lynn were very concerning to the Committee. And I
2 suggested to him that if he wanted to move things forward, the
3 best way to do it would be to come to us with a fulsome term
4 sheet that explained exactly what it was in clear and precise
5 detail that Mr. Dondero was proposing, and that would be the
6 best way to move the process forward, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lynn, anything to add to
8 that?

9 MR. LYNN: Well, Your Honor, my experience in
10 negotiations is that it is useful to agree on substantive
11 terms, or at least be in the ballpark, before term sheets are
12 exchanged. Long ago, a term sheet was prepared and presented
13 to the Committee. Ultimately, I think it was rejected, though
14 I don't know if we ever received a formal rejection.

15 I explained in my emails, which I'm happy to share with
16 the Court if Your Honor wants to see them, why I was reluctant
17 to try to put into a term sheet form the proposal that I
18 suggested to Mr. Clemente. As I said, I'm more than happy to
19 provide you with that email chain and let you form your own
20 judgment, Your Honor, as to whether we're proceeding in good
21 faith.

22 THE COURT: All right. Well I'm not going to ask --

23 MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor? Your Honor, this is Jeff
24 Pomerantz.

25 THE COURT: -- to see any of that. Mr. Pomerantz?

1 MR. POMERANTZ: May I just be heard real quickly?

2 THE COURT: Sure.

3 MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, we also took Your Honor's
4 comments to heart. We, Mr. Seery and I, had an over-an-hour
5 conversation with Mr. Lynn and with Mr. Bonds. We provided
6 them with our thoughts as to what they needed to do in order
7 to move forward. Of course, it's not really the Debtor to
8 agree. It's the creditors to agree. But as Mr. Seery has
9 testified many times before and as I have told the Court, we
10 would support a plan that the Committee and Mr. Dondero could
11 get behind.

12 So we again -- I'm not going to divulge the nature of
13 those communications, but we suggested several things that Mr.
14 Dondero could do in order to move the ball forward, and
15 unfortunately, we have not seen any of those things done thus
16 far. So we are, at this point, not optimistic that there will
17 be a grand bargain plan.

18 THE COURT: All right.

19 MR. DONDERO: Your Honor, could I comment for a
20 second? This is Mr. Dondero.

21 THE COURT: If you and your counsel want you to
22 comment, you can comment.

23 MR. DONDERO: I'd love to do a pot plan. I would
24 love to reach some kind of settlement and everybody move on
25 with their lives. The estate started with \$360 million of

1 third-party assets and \$90 million of notes. The \$360 million
2 of third-party assets are down to \$130 million.

3 MR. POMERANTZ: Again, Your Honor, I must interrupt.
4 I did this at the last hearing, and it's not my practice to
5 interrupt, but issues regarding what the value is or not, it's
6 going to require a response, and that's not really before Your
7 Honor. I think before Your Honor is --

8 MR. DONDERO: Okay.

9 MR. POMERANTZ: -- have there been negotiations?
10 Have they been in good faith? If Mr. Dondero wanted to
11 address that, that's fine, but I object to having any
12 discussion at this point, especially with Mr. Dondero not even
13 under oath, on what the nature of the value of the assets and
14 why they have changed and what not.

15 THE COURT: Well, --

16 MR. POMERANTZ: It's just not appropriate.

17 THE COURT: I understand --

18 MR. DONDERO: Okay. Can I --

19 THE COURT: Stop.

20 MR. DONDERO: Can I -- can I finish?

21 THE COURT: Let me please respond to that. I
22 understand your concern, but I've heard from Mr. Seery
23 testimony many months ago about the value plummeting during
24 the case. And I asked why, and I got some explanations. This
25 is not evidence. This is just, you know, this is not going to

1 be binding in any way. Mr. Dondero can speak as to what he
2 thinks, you know, the situation is.

3 Go ahead, Mr. Dondero.

4 MR. DONDERO: Okay. I'm not trying to fixate on the
5 numbers. And as far as the third-party assets are, we would
6 be willing to pay -- I would be willing to pay for those. I'd
7 be willing to pay more, and even some value for the affiliate
8 notes that were really part of compensation agreements
9 throughout the history of Highland and avoid the POC
10 arguments. I'd be willing to pay for the assets and I'd be
11 willing to pay even more than that.

12 I have no transparency in terms of what the assets are,
13 and there's no fulsome discussion in terms of, well, here are
14 the assets, here are the notes, here's what we think the
15 values are, can you get to this number? It's just a -- you --
16 the -- it -- I don't view there is good-faith negotiations
17 going on because it's always just a: You need to put a big
18 number on a piece of paper; otherwise, you're going to get run
19 over.

20 And there's no back and forth going on, but it's not due
21 to a lack of willingness on my part. And maybe there needs to
22 be a committee set up. Maybe there needs to be, I don't know,
23 a mediator or an examiner or somebody to try and push through
24 the pot plan, but there's nothing happening. People are not
25 returning the judge's calls, I mean, Mr. Lynn's calls, or my

1 calls. They're -- there's -- despite efforts of our -- of my
2 own and a willingness of my own, there's no negotiations of
3 any sort going on at the moment.

4 THE COURT: All right. I don't want anyone to
5 respond to that. I know people have different views of what's
6 going on. But let me just say a couple of things, and then
7 we're done.

8 We do have a Committee in this case. We have a Committee
9 with very sophisticated members and very sophisticated
10 professionals. Okay? That's who I wanted you to be talking
11 to before the end of the day Tuesday.

12 We have had co-mediators in this case. Okay? And, you
13 know, I identified very sophisticated human beings for that
14 role. Okay? And in fact, there ended up being settlements
15 that flowed out of the co-mediator process.

16 We're now 15 months into the case. There are major,
17 significant compromises now: HarbourVest, UBS, Acis, Terry,
18 and Redeemer Committee. I hate to use a worn-out metaphor,
19 but the train is leaving the station. We've got confirmation.
20 I've pushed out two weeks. I mean, you all are either going
21 to get there in the next few days or we're just going to go
22 forward with I think what everyone, you know, would rather be
23 a pot plan, but if we can't get there, we're just going to
24 have to consider the plan that's on the table now. Okay?

25 You know, the Committee, again, they're sophisticated.

1 They can compare apples to oranges and decide whether the plan
2 on the table, with its risks of future litigation and
3 recoveries, whether it's better or worse than whatever
4 consideration you're offering, Mr. Dondero.

5 And you know, as we all know, there is distrust here,
6 there, and everywhere among these parties. So I can totally
7 understand them, you know, taking a hard line: We either get
8 all cash or we're just not going to mess with it. We don't
9 want to risk broken promises. We'd rather just do litigation.

10 So, anyway, that's as much as I'm going to say except I am
11 going to further direct good-faith negotiations. It sounds
12 like to me a written term sheet might be the appropriate next
13 step, given where I've heard things are at the moment. But,
14 you know, I guess we don't have any hearings between now and
15 the 26th, right? No Highland hearings that I can think of
16 between now and the 26th.

17 MR. POMERANTZ: I don't think so.

18 MR. MORRIS: I think that's correct, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: So you have all this time --

20 MR. MORRIS: At the moment.

21 THE COURT: You have all this time to negotiate and
22 simultaneously get ready for the confirmation hearing without
23 any other battles. So I know you will use the time well.

24 All right. We're adjourned.

25 THE CLERK: All rise.

1 MR. BONDS: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 (Proceedings concluded at 2:04 p.m.)

3 --oOo--

14
15
16
17
18
19
20 CERTIFICATE

21 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
22 the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the
above-entitled matter.

23 **/s/ Kathy Rehling**

01/16/2021

24 _____
25 Kathy Rehling, CETD-444
Certified Electronic Court Transcriber

Date

INDEX

1		
2	PROCEEDINGS	3
3	OPENING STATEMENTS	
4	- By Mr. Morris	12
	- By Mr. Kane	18
5	- By Ms. Weisgerber	18
	- By Mr. Draper	20
6	WITNESSES	
7	Debtor's Witnesses	
8	James Seery	
9	- Direct Examination by Mr. Morris	26
	- Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson	62
10	- Cross-Examination by Mr. Draper	87
11	- Redirect Examination by Mr. Morris	93
12	HarbourVest's Witnesses	
13	Michael Pugatch	
	- Direct Examination by Ms. Weisgerber	96
14	- Cross-Examination by Mr. Wilson	113
15	EXHIBITS	
16	Debtor's Exhibits A through EE	Received 35
17	James Dondero's Exhibits A through M	Received 142
18	James Dondero's Exhibit N (as specified)	Received 71
19	HarbourVest's Exhibit 34	Received 100
	HarbourVest's Exhibit 36	Received 103
20	HarbourVest's Exhibits 39 through 42	Received 137
21	CLOSING ARGUMENTS	
22	- By Mr. Morris	143
	- By Ms. Weisgerber	144
23	- By Mr. Lynn	146
24	- By Mr. Draper	148
25		

INDEX
Page 2

RULINGS

Motion to Compromise Controversy with HarbourVest 2017 150
Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.,
HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV
International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base
AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. filed by Debtor
Highland Capital Management, L.P. (1625)

Motion to Allow Claims of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 150
3018(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for
Temporary Allowance of Claims for Purposes of Voting to
Accept or Reject the Plan filed by Creditor HarbourVest
et al. (1207)

Debtor's Motion Pursuant to the Protocols for Authority 157
for Highland Multi-Strategy Credit Fund, L.P. to Prepay
Loan (1590)

END OF PROCEEDINGS 171

INDEX 172-173

EXHIBIT 10




CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ENTERED

THE DATE OF ENTRY IS ON
THE COURT'S DOCKET

The following constitutes the ruling of the court and has the force and effect therein described.

Signed January 20, 2021


United States Bankruptcy Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,¹

Debtor.

§
§
§
§
§
§

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054-sgj11

**ORDER APPROVING DEBTOR'S SETTLEMENT
WITH HARBOURVEST (CLAIM NOS. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) AND
AUTHORIZING ACTIONS CONSISTENT THEREWITH**

This matter having come before the Court on *Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1625] (the "Motion"),² filed by Highland Capital Management, L.P., the debtor and debtor-in-possession (the "Debtor") in the above-captioned chapter 11 case (the "Bankruptcy Case"); and this Court having considered (a) the

¹ The Debtor's last four digits of its taxpayer identification number are (6725). The headquarters and service address for the above-captioned Debtor is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201.

² Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein have the meanings ascribed to them in the Motion.



Motion; (b) the *Declaration of John A. Morris in Support of the Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1631] (the "Morris Declaration"), and the exhibits annexed thereto, including the Settlement Agreement attached as **Exhibit "1"** (the "Settlement Agreement"); (c) the arguments and law cited in the Motion; (d) *James Dondero's Objection to Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest* [Docket No. 1697] (the "Dondero Objection"), filed by James Dondero; (e) the *Objection to Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1706] (the "Trusts' Objection"), filed by the Dugaboy Investment Trust ("Dugaboy") and Get Good Trust ("Get Good," and together with Dugaboy, the "Trusts"); (f) *CLO Holdco's Objection to HarbourVest Settlement* [Docket No. 1707] (the "CLOH Objection" and collectively, with the Dondero Objection and the Trusts' Objection, the "Objections"), filed by CLO Holdco, Ltd.; (g) the *Debtor's Omnibus Reply in Support of Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, 154), and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1731] (the "Debtor's Reply"), filed by the Debtor; (h) the *HarbourVest Reply in Support of Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith* [Docket No. 1734] (the "HarbourVest Reply"), filed by HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (collectively, "HarbourVest"); (i) the testimonial and documentary evidence admitted into evidence during the hearing held on January 14, 2021 (the "Hearing"), including assessing the credibility of the witnesses; and (j) the

arguments made during the Hearing; and this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334; and this Court having found that this is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); and this Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Motion in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and this Court having found that the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interests of the Debtor's estate, its creditors, and other parties-in-interest; and this Court having found the Settlement Agreement fair and equitable; and this Court having analyzed, for the reasons stated on the record, (1) the probability of success in litigating the claims subject to the Settlement Agreement, with due consideration for the uncertainty in fact and law, (2) the complexity and likely duration of litigation and any attendant expense, inconvenience, and delay, and (3) all other factors bearing on the wisdom of the compromise, including: (i) the best interests of the creditors, with proper deference to their reasonable views, and (ii) the extent to which the settlement is truly the product of arms-length bargaining, and not of fraud or collusion; and this Court having found that the Debtor's notice of the Motion and opportunity for a hearing on the Motion were appropriate under the circumstances and that no other notice need be provided; and this Court having determined that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion establish good cause for the relief granted herein; and upon all of the proceedings had before this Court; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefor, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Motion is **GRANTED** as set forth herein.
2. All objections to the Motion are overruled.
3. The Settlement Agreement, attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**, is approved in all respects pursuant to Rule 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

4. All objections to the proofs of claim subject to the Motion³ are overruled as moot in light of the Court's approval of the Settlement Agreement.

5. The Debtor, HarbourVest, and all other parties are authorized to take any and all actions necessary and desirable to implement the Settlement Agreement without need of further approval or notice.

6. Pursuant to the express terms of the *Members Agreement Relating to the Company*, dated November 15, 2017, HarbourVest is authorized to transfer its interests in HCLOF to a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of the Debtor pursuant to the terms of the *Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.* without the need to obtain the consent of any party or to offer such interests first to any other investor in HCLOF.

7. The Court shall retain exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine all matters arising from the implementation of this Order.

###End of Order###

³ This includes the *Debtor's First Omnibus Objection to Certain (A) Duplicate Claims; (B) Overstated Claims; (C) Late-Filed Claims; (D) Satisfied Claims; (E) No-Liability Claims; and (F) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 906].

EXHIBIT 1

EXECUTION VERSION

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (the “Agreement”) is entered into as of December 23, 2020, between Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”), on the one hand, and HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., and HarbourVest Partners L.P. (each, a “HarbourVest Party,” and collectively, “HarbourVest”), on the other hand. Each of the foregoing are sometimes referred to herein collectively as the “Parties” and individually as a “Party.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Case”) in the Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 19-12239 (CSS) (the “Delaware Bankruptcy Court”);

WHEREAS, on December 4, 2019, the Delaware Bankruptcy Court entered an order transferring venue of the Debtor’s case to the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, Case No. 19-34054-sgj (the “Bankruptcy Court”);

WHEREAS, prior to the Petition Date, HarbourVest invested in Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. f/k/a Acis Loan Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”) and acquired an a 49.98% ownership interest in HCLOF (the “HarbourVest Interests”);

WHEREAS, the portfolio manager for HCLOF is Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd., a subsidiary of the Debtor;

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2020, HarbourVest filed proofs of claim in the Bankruptcy Case, which are listed on the Debtor’s claims register as claim numbers 143, 147, 149, 150, 153, and 154 (the “HarbourVest Claims”), asserting claims against the Debtor relating to its investment in HCLOF;

WHEREAS, on July 30, 2020, the Debtor filed the *Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Certain (a) Duplicate Claims; (b) Overstated Claims; (c) Late-Filed Claims; (d) Satisfied Claims; (e) No Liability Claims; and (f) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 906], in which the Debtor objected to the HarbourVest Claims;

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2020, HarbourVest filed the *HarbourVest Response to Debtor’s First Omnibus Objection to Creation (a) Duplicate Claims; (b) Overstated Claims; (c) Late-Filed Claims; (d) Satisfied Claims; (e) No Liability Claims; and (f) Insufficient-Documentation Claims* [Docket No. 1057] (the “HarbourVest Response”);

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2020, HarbourVest filed the *Motion of HarbourVest Pursuant to Rule 3018(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for Temporary Allowance of Claims for Purposes of Voting to Accept or Reject the Plan* [Docket No. 1207] (the “3018 Motion” and together with the HarbourVest Response, the “HarbourVest Pleadings”);

EXECUTION VERSION

WHEREAS, in the HarbourVest Pleadings, HarbourVest asserted, among other things, that the HarbourVest Claims included claims against the Debtor arising from fraudulent inducement, fraudulent concealment, fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of securities laws, and misuse of assets and sought damages in excess of \$300,000,000;

WHEREAS, the Debtor disputes the HarbourVest Claims;

WHEREAS, on November 24, 2020, the Debtor filed the *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization for Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1472] (as amended, the “Plan”).¹

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to enter into this Agreement which incorporates, formalizes, and finalizes the full and final resolution of the HarbourVest Claims and HarbourVest Pleadings; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement will be presented to the Bankruptcy Court for approval pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 (“Rule 9019”).

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, the covenants, conditions, and promises made herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the Parties agree as follows:

1. **Settlement of Claims.**

(a) In full and complete satisfaction of the HarbourVest Claims, HarbourVest will receive:

(i) an allowed, nonpriority general unsecured claim in the aggregate amount of \$45,000,000 (the “Allowed GUC Claim”); and

(ii) an allowed subordinated claim in the aggregate amount of \$35,000,000 (the “Allowed Subordinated Claim” and together with the Allowed GUC Claim, the “Allowed Claims”).

(b) On the Effective Date, HarbourVest will transfer all of its rights, title, and interest in the HarbourVest Interests to the Debtor or its nominee pursuant to the terms of the *Transfer Agreement for Ordinary Shares of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.*, attached hereto as Exhibit A (the “Transfer Agreements”) and the Debtor or its nominee will become a shareholder of HCLOF with respect to the HarbourVest Interests. The terms of the Transfer Agreements are incorporated into this Agreement by reference.

2. **Releases.**

(a) Upon the Effective Date, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, each HarbourVest Party on behalf of itself and each of its current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents,

¹ All capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings given to them in the Plan.

EXECUTION VERSION

participants, subsidiaries, parents, successors, designees, and assigns hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue, the Debtor, HCLOF, HCLOF's current and former directors, and the Debtor's current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns, except as expressly set forth below (the "Debtor Released Parties"), for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney's fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including, without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether known or unknown, including, without limitation, those which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the "HarbourVest Released Claims").

(b) Upon the Effective Date, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Debtor hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue (i) each HarbourVest Party and (ii) each HarbourVest Party's current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns (the "HarbourVest Released Parties"), for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney's fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including, without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether known or unknown, which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the "Debtor Released Claims"); *provided, however*, that notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the release contained in this Section 2(b) will apply to the HarbourVest Released Parties set forth in subsection (b)(ii) only with respect to Debtor Released Claims arising from or relating to HarbourVest's ownership of the HarbourVest Interests.

(c) Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, the releases set forth herein will not apply with respect to (i) the Allowed Claims, (ii) the claims of Charlotte Investor IV, L.P., or (iii) the duties, rights, or obligations of any Party under this Agreement or the Transfer Agreements.

3. **Agreement Subject to Bankruptcy Court Approval.** The effectiveness of this Agreement and the Parties' obligations hereunder are conditioned in all respects on the approval of this Agreement by the Bankruptcy Court. The Parties agree to cooperate and use reasonable efforts to have this Agreement approved by the Bankruptcy Court. The "Effective Date" will be the date of an order entered by the Bankruptcy Court approving this Agreement pursuant to a motion filed under Rule 9019.

EXECUTION VERSION

4. **Representations and Warranties.** Subject in all respects to Section 3 hereof:

(a) each HarbourVest Party represents and warrants that (i) it has full authority to enter into this Agreement and to release the HarbourVest Released Claims and has not sold, transferred, or assigned any HarbourVest Released Claim to any other person or entity, (ii) no person or entity other than such HarbourVest Party has been, is, or will be authorized to bring, pursue, or enforce any HarbourVest Released Claim on behalf of, for the benefit of, or in the name of (whether directly or derivatively) of such HarbourVest Party; and (iii) HarbourVest owns all of the HCLOF Interests free and clear of any claims or interests; and

(b) the Debtor represents and warrants to HarbourVest that (i) it has full authority to enter into this Agreement and to release the Debtor Released Claims and (ii) no person or entity other than the Debtor has been, is, or will be authorized to bring, pursue, or enforce any Debtor Released Claim on behalf of, for the benefit of, or in the name of (whether directly or derivatively) of the Debtor Party.

5. **Plan Support.**

(a) Each HarbourVest Party hereby agrees that it will (a) vote all HarbourVest Claims held by such HarbourVest Party to accept the Plan, by delivering its duly executed and completed ballots accepting the Plan on a timely basis; and (b) not (i) change, withdraw, or revoke such vote (or cause or direct such vote to be changed withdrawn or revoked); (ii) exercise any right or remedy for the enforcement, collection, or recovery of any claim against the Debtor except in a manner consistent with this Agreement or the Plan, (iii) object to, impede, or take any action other action to interfere with, delay or postpone acceptance or confirmation of the Plan; (iv) directly or indirectly solicit, propose, file, support, participate in the formulation of or vote for, any restructuring, sale of assets (including pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 363), merger, workout, or plan of reorganization of the Debtor other than the Plan; or (v) otherwise take any action that would in any material respect interfere with, delay, or postpone the consummation of the Plan; provided, however, that such vote may be revoked (and, upon such revocation, deemed void ab initio) by such HarbourVest Party at any time following the termination of this agreement or the occurrence of a Support Termination Event (it being understood that any termination of this agreement shall entitle each HarbourVest Party to change its vote in accordance with section 1127(d) of the Bankruptcy Code), notwithstanding any voting deadline established by the Bankruptcy Court including without limitation the January 5, 2021, 5:00 p.m. (prevailing Central Time) deadline established by the *Order Approving Form of Ballots, Voting Deadline and Solicitation Procedures* [Docket No. 1476].

(b) In full resolution of the 3018 Motion, HarbourVest will have a general unsecured claim for voting purposes only in the amount of \$45,000,000.

(c) The obligations of the HarbourVest Parties under this Section 5 shall automatically terminate upon the occurrence of any of the following (each a “Support Termination Event”): (i) the effective date of the Plan, (ii) the withdrawal of the Plan, (iii) the entry of an order by the Bankruptcy Court (A) converting the Bankruptcy Case to a case under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code or (B) appointing an examiner with expanded powers beyond those set forth in sections 1106(a)(3) and (4) of the Bankruptcy Code or a trustee in Bankruptcy

EXECUTION VERSION

Case, or (iv) the failure of the Court to enter an order approving the terms of this Agreement and the settlement described herein pursuant to Rule 9019 prior to confirmation of the Plan.

6. **No Admission of Liability.** The Parties acknowledge that there is a bona fide dispute with respect to the HarbourVest Claims. Nothing in this Agreement will imply, an admission of liability, fault or wrongdoing by the Debtor, HarbourVest, or any other person, and the execution of this Agreement does not constitute an admission of liability, fault, or wrongdoing on the part of the Debtor, HarbourVest, or any other person.

7. **Successors-in-Interest.** This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of each of the Parties and their successors, and assigns.

8. **Notice.** Each notice and other communication hereunder will be in writing and will be sent by email and delivered or mailed by registered mail, receipt requested, and will be deemed to have been given on the date of its delivery, if delivered, and on the fifth full business day following the date of the mailing, if mailed to each of the Parties thereto at the following respective addresses or such other address as may be specified in any notice delivered or mailed as set forth below:

HARBOURVEST

HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Attention: Michael J. Pugatch
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Telephone No. 617-348-3712
E-mail: mpugatch@harbourvest.com

with a copy (which shall not constitute notice) to:

Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
Attention: M. Natasha Labovitz, Esq.
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone No. 212-909-6649
E-mail: nlabovitz@debevoise.com

THE DEBTOR

Highland Capital Management, L.P.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Attention: James P. Seery, Jr.
Telephone No.: 972-628-4100
Facsimile No.: 972-628-4147
E-mail: jpseeryjr@gmail.com

EXECUTION VERSION

with a copy (which shall not constitute notice) to:

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Attention: Jeffrey Pomerantz, Esq.
 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90067
 Telephone No.: 310-277-6910
 Facsimile No.: 310-201-0760
 E-mail: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com

9. **Advice of Counsel.** Each Party represents that it has: (a) been adequately represented by independent legal counsel of its own choice, throughout all of the negotiations that preceded the execution of this Agreement; (b) executed this Agreement upon the advice of such counsel; (c) read this Agreement, and understands and assents to all the terms and conditions contained herein without any reservations; and (d) had the opportunity to have this Agreement and all the terms and conditions contained herein explained by independent counsel, who has answered any and all questions asked of such counsel, or which could have been asked of such counsel, including, but not limited to, with regard to the meaning and effect of any of the provisions of this Agreement.

10. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement and the Transfer Agreement contain the entire agreement and understanding concerning the subject matter of this Agreement, and supersede and replace all prior negotiations and agreements, written or oral and executed or unexecuted, concerning such subject matter. Each of the Parties acknowledges that no other Party, nor any agent of or attorney for any such Party, has made any promise, representation or warranty, express or implied, written or oral, not otherwise contained in this Agreement to induce any Party to execute this Agreement. The Parties further acknowledge that they are not executing this Agreement in reliance on any promise, representation or warranty not contained in this Agreement, and that any such reliance would be unreasonable. This Agreement will not be waived or modified except by an agreement in writing signed by each Party or duly authorized representative of each Party.

11. **No Party Deemed Drafter.** The Parties acknowledge that the terms of this Agreement are contractual and are the result of arms'-length negotiations between the Parties and their chosen counsel. Each Party and its counsel cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. In any construction to be made of this Agreement, the Agreement will not be construed against any Party.

12. **Future Cooperation.** The Parties agree to cooperate and execute such further documentation as is reasonably necessary to effectuate the intent of this Agreement.

13. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in counterparts with the same force and effect as if executed in one complete document. Each Party's signature hereto will signify acceptance of, and agreement to, the terms and provisions contained in this Agreement. Photographic, electronic, and facsimile copies of signed counterparts may be used in lieu of the originals of this Agreement for any purpose.

EXECUTION VERSION

14. **Governing Law; Venue; Attorneys' Fees and Costs.** The Parties agree that this Agreement will be governed by and will be construed according to the laws of the State of Texas without regard to conflict-of-law principles. Each of the Parties hereby submits to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court during the pendency of the Bankruptcy Case and thereafter to the exclusive jurisdiction of the state and federal courts located in the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, with respect to any disputes arising from or out of this Agreement. In any action to enforce this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees and costs (including experts).

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

EXECUTION VERSION

IT IS HEREBY AGREED.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

By: /s/ James P. Seery, Jr.
Name: James P. Seery, Jr.
Its: CEO/CRO

HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., by HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P., its General Partner, by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its Managing Member

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited, its Alternative Investment Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

HarbourVest Partners L.P., on behalf of funds and accounts under management, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

EXECUTION VERSION

**HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P., by HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited, its
Alternative Investment Fund Manager, by HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed
Investment Manager, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC, its General Partner**

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

**HV International VIII Secondary L.P., by HIPEP VIII Associates L.P., its General
Partner, by HarbourVest GP LLC, its General Partner, by HarbourVest Partners, LLC,
its Managing Member**

By: /s/ Michael Pugatch
Name: Michael Pugatch
Its: Managing Director

Exhibit A

TRANSFER AGREEMENT FOR ORDINARY SHARES OF HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD.

This Transfer Agreement, dated as of January ____, 2021 (this “**Transfer Agreement**”), is entered into by and among Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (the “**Fund**”), Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. (the “**Portfolio Manager**”), HCMLP Investments, LLC (the “**Transferee**”) and each of the following: HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P., HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P., HV International VIII Secondary L.P., and HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. (collectively, the “**Transferors**”).

WHEREAS, each Transferor is the record, legal and beneficial owner of the number of ordinary shares (“**Shares**”) of the Fund set forth opposite such Transferor’s name on Exhibit A hereto (with respect to each Transferor, the “**Transferred Shares**”).

WHEREAS the Transferee is an affiliate and wholly owned subsidiary of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“**HCMLP**”) which is one of the initial members of the Fund.

WHEREAS, each Transferor wishes to transfer and assign 100% of its rights, title and interest as a shareholder in the Fund, including the Transferred Shares (the “**Interest**”) on the terms set forth in this Transfer Agreement.

WHEREAS, subject to and in connection with the approval of that certain Settlement Agreement, dated on or about the date hereof, by and among HCMLP and the Transferors (the “**Settlement Agreement**”), the Transferee desires that the Interest be transferred to Transferee and that thereafter the Transferee will become a Shareholder and the Transferors will no longer be Shareholders.

WHEREAS, the Portfolio Manager desires to consent to such transfers and to the admission of Transferee as a Shareholder on the terms set forth herein, and the Transferors and Transferee agree to such terms.

WHEREAS, the Fund desires to amend its records to reflect the foregoing transfers.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Transfer of Shares and Advisory Board

- a. Each Transferor hereby transfers and assigns all of its rights, title, and interest in its Interest to the Transferee, and the Transferee wishes to be admitted to the Fund as a Shareholder.
- b. In connection with the transfer of the Interest as contemplated herein, the Transferee shall be granted the right to appoint a representative to the Fund’s advisory board (the “**Advisory Board**”) to replace the Transferors’ appointed representative to the Advisory Board.

- c. Transferee hereby assumes all of Transferor's rights and obligations in respect of the Interest effective as of the Effective Date (as defined below) and acknowledge that thereafter Transferee shall be subject to the applicable terms and provisions of the Members' Agreement dated as of November 15, 2017 (the "**Members' Agreement**"), the Articles of Incorporation adopted November 15, 2017 (the "**Articles**") and the Subscription and transfer Agreement, dated as of November 15, 2017 among each Transferor, the Fund and the Portfolio Manager (the "**Subscription Agreement**", and together with the Members' Agreement and the Articles, the "**Fund Agreements**") with respect to the Interest. Transferee does not assume any liability or responsibility for any obligations or liabilities incurred by any Transferor prior to the Effective Date of the transfer.
 - d. Following the transfer, each Transferor shall have no further rights or obligations to any party hereunder in respect of the Interest under the Fund Agreements.
 - e. This Transfer Agreement, and the parties' obligations hereunder, are conditioned in all respects on the approval by the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 of (i) this Transfer Agreement and (ii) the Settlement Agreement, and each of the parties agree that no further action shall be required from any party for the transfer of the Interest to be effective except as described herein.
2. Transferee's Representations and Warranties. The Transferee represents and warrants to the Transferors, the Portfolio Manager, and the Fund as follows:
- a. This Transfer Agreement constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the Transferee, enforceable against it in accordance with its terms;
 - b. This Transfer Agreement has been duly and validly executed and delivered by or on behalf of the Transferee and such execution and delivery have been duly authorized by all necessary trust action of the Transferee;
 - c. The Transferee acknowledges receipt of, has read, and is familiar with, the Fund's Offering Memorandum for Placing Shares dated November 15, 2017 (the "**Offering Memorandum**") and the Fund Agreements;
 - d. The Transferee hereby accepts and receives the Interest from the Transferors for investment, and not with a view to the sale or distribution of any part thereof, and the Transferee has no present intention of selling, granting participations in, or otherwise distributing the same, but subject nevertheless to any requirement of law that the disposition of the Transferee's property shall at all times be within such Transferee's control; and
 - e. The Transferee is an "Eligible U.S. Investor" as defined in the Offering Memorandum.

3. Transferors' Representations and Warranties. Each Transferor represents and warrants to the Transferee, the Portfolio Manager, and the Fund as follows:
 - a. This Transfer Agreement constitutes a valid and binding obligation of the Transferor, enforceable against it in accordance with its terms;
 - b. This Transfer Agreement has been duly authorized, and duly and validly executed and delivered by the Transferor and such execution and delivery have been duly authorized by all necessary action of the Transferor; and
 - c. As of the date hereof, the Transferor has good and valid title to the Transferor's Interest, free and clear of any liens, vesting requirements or claims by others.
4. Consent to Transfer. Based in part on the representations and warranties of the Transferors and the Transferee which are included herein, and on the terms contained herein, the Portfolio Manager and the Fund hereby consent to the transfers of the Interest, the admission of the Transferee as a Shareholder and the Transferee's appointment of a representative to the Advisory Board, the Portfolio Manager's execution of this Transfer Agreement constituting its prior written consent to the transfers of the Interest for the purposes of article 18.1 of the Articles and this Transfer Agreement constituting express notice in writing to the Fund of the assignment set out at clause 1(c) above for the purposes of the Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Guernsey) Law, 1979 (as amended).
5. Completion: As of the date of approval by the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019 of (i) this Transfer Agreement and (ii) the Settlement Agreement (the "**Effective Date**"):
 - a. each Transferor shall deliver or cause to be delivered to the Transferee a transfer instrument relating to the Transferred Shares duly executed and completed by that Transferor in favor of the Transferee; and
 - b. the Transferee shall deliver to the Transferors and the Fund a duly executed and dated Adherence Agreement (as defined in the Members' Agreement).

Prior to the Effective Date the Transferee shall procure that:

 - c. the board of directors of the Fund shall hold a meeting at which the transfer of the Shares to the Transferee shall be approved and registration in the register of members of the Fund shall be effected on the Effective Date.
6. Miscellaneous.
 - a. Each of the parties hereto agree to execute any further instruments and perform any further acts which are or may become reasonably necessary to carry out the intent of this Transfer Agreement or are reasonably requested by the Portfolio Manager, the Fund or a Transferor to complete the transfer of the Interest.

- b. The parties to this Transfer Agreement acknowledge that the terms of this Transfer Agreement are the result of arms'-length negotiations between the parties and their respective counsel. Each party and its counsel cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Transfer Agreement. In any construction to be made of this Transfer Agreement, the language or drafting of this Transfer Agreement will not be construed against any party.
- c. This Transfer Agreement shall be governed by, and construed and enforced in accordance with, the internal substantive laws of the state of Delaware, without giving effect to conflicts of law principles.
- d. The representations, warranties and covenants of the Transferors and the Transferee shall remain in full force and effect following the transfer of the Interest, and the Fund and the Portfolio Manager thereafter may rely on all such representations, warranties and covenants.
- e. This Transfer Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Photographic, electronic, and facsimile copies of signed counterparts may be used in lieu of the originals of this Transfer Agreement for any purpose.
- f. Captions of sections have been added only for convenience and shall not be deemed to be a part of this Transfer Agreement.
- g. This Transfer Agreement is among the parties hereto. No Person that is not a party hereto shall have any right herein as a third-party beneficiary or otherwise except as expressly contemplated hereby.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have executed this Transfer Agreement as of the date first above written.

TRANSFeree:

HCMLP Investments, LLC

By: Highland Capital Management, L.P.

Its: Member

By: _____

Name: James P. Seery, Jr.

Title: Chief Executive Officer

PORTFOLIO MANAGER:

Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd.

By: _____

Name: James P. Seery, Jr.

Title: President

FUND:

Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.

By: _____

Name:

Title:

[Additional Signatures on Following Page]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have executed this Transfer Agreement as of the date first above written.

TRANSFERORS:

HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P., its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HV International VIII Secondary L.P.

By: HIPEP VIII Associates L.P.
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its Managing Member

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited
Its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its General Partner

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners (Ireland) Limited
Its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners L.P.
Its Duly Appointed Investment Manager

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its General Partner

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.

By: HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P.
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC
Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC
Its Managing Member

By: _____

Name: Michael Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

[Signature Page to Transfer of Ordinary Shares of Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.]

Exhibit A

<u>Transferee Name</u>	<u>Number of Shares</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P.	54,355,482.14	71.0096%
HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.	7,426,940.38	9.7025%
HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.	3,713,508.46	4.8513%
HV International VIII Secondary L.P.	9,946,780.11	12.9944%
HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P.	1,103,956.03	1.4422%

EXHIBIT 11

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

CHARITABLE DAF FUND, L.P.
and CLO HOLDCO, LTD.,
directly and derivatively,

Plaintiffs,

V.

Cause No. _____

**HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,
L.P. , HIGHLAND HCF ADVISOR, LTD.,
and HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD.,
*nominally,***

Defendants.

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

I.

INTRODUCTION

This action arises out of the acts and omissions of Defendant Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“HCM”), which is the general manager of Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. (“HCFA”), both of which are registered investment advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the “Advisers Act”),¹ and nominal Defendant Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (“HCLOF”) (HCM and HCFA each a “Defendant,” or together, “Defendants”). The acts and omissions which have recently come to light reveal breaches of fiduciary duty, a pattern of violations of the Advisers Act’s anti-fraud provisions, and concealed breaches of the HCLOF Company Agreement, among others, which have caused and/or likely will cause Plaintiffs damages.

¹ <https://adviserinfo.sec.gov/firm/summary/110126>



At all relevant times, HCM was headed by CEO and potential party James P. Seery (“Seery”). Seery negotiated a settlement with the several Harbourvest² entities who owned 49.98% of HCLOF. The deal had HCM (or its designee) purchasing the Harbourvest membership interests in HCLOF for \$22.5 million. Recent revelations, however, show that the sale was predicated upon a sales price that was vastly below the Net Asset Value (“NAV”) of those interests. Upon information and belief, the NAV of HCLOF’s assets had risen precipitously, but was not disclosed to Harbourvest nor to Plaintiffs.

Under the Advisers Act, Defendants have a non-waivable duty of loyalty and candor, which includes its duty not to inside trade with its own investors, *i.e.*, not to trade with an investor to which HCM and Seery had access to superior non-public information. Upon information and belief, HCM’s internal compliance policies required by the Advisers Act would not generally have allowed a trade of this nature to go forward—meaning, the trade either was approved in spite of compliance rules preventing it, or the compliance protocols themselves were disabled or amended to a level that leaves Defendants HCM and HCLOF exposed to liability. Thus, Defendants have created an unacceptable perpetuation of exposure to liability.

Additionally, Defendants are liable for a pattern of conduct that gives rise to liability for their conduct of the enterprise consisting of HCM in relation to HCFA and HCLOF, through a pattern of concealment, misrepresentation, and violations of the securities rules. In the alternative, HCFA and HCM, are guilty of self-dealing, violations of the Advisers Act, and tortious interference by (a) not disclosing that Harbourvest had agreed to sell at a price well below the current NAV, and (b) diverting the Harbourvest opportunity to themselves.

² “Harbourvest” refers to the collective of Harbourvest Dover Street IX Investment, L.P., Harbourvest 2017 Global AIF, L.P., Harbourvest 2017 Global Fund, L.P., HV International VIII Secondary, L.P., and Harbourvest Skew Base AIF, L.P. Each was a member of Defendant Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.

For these reasons, judgment should be issued in Plaintiffs' favor.

II.

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff CLO Holdco, Ltd. is a limited company incorporated under the laws of the Cayman Islands.

2. Plaintiff Charitable DAF Fund, L.P., ("DAF") is a limited partnership formed under the laws of the Cayman Islands.

3. Defendant Highland Capital Management, L.P. is a limited partnership with its principal place of business at 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75201. It may be served at its principal place of business or through its principal officer, James P. Seery, Jr., or through the Texas Secretary of State, or through any other means authorized by federal or state law.

4. Defendant Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd. is a limited company incorporated under the laws of the Cayman Islands. Its principal place of business is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75201. It is a registered investment adviser ("RIA") subject to the laws and regulations of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (the "Adviser's Act"). It is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Highland Capital Management, L.P.

5. Nominal Defendant Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. is a limited company incorporated under the laws of the Island of Guernsey. Its registered office is at First Floor, Dorey Court, Admiral Park, St. Peter Port, Guernsey GY1 6HJ, Channel Islands. Its principal place of business is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75201.

6. Potential party James P. Seery, Jr. ("Seery") is an officer and/or director and/or control person of Defendants Highland Capital Management, L.P., Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., and Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd., and is a citizen of and domiciled in Floral Park, New York.

III.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this dispute under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as one or more rights and/or causes of action arise under the laws of the United States. This Court has supplemental subject matter jurisdiction over all other claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

8. Personal jurisdiction is proper over the Defendants because they reside and/or have continual contacts with the state of Texas, having regularly submitted to jurisdiction here. Jurisdiction is also proper under 18 U.S.C. § 1965(d).

9. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because one or more Defendants reside in this district and/or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated in this district. Venue in this district is further provided under 18 U.S.C. § 1965(d).

IV.

RELEVANT BACKGROUND

HCLOF IS FORMED

10. Plaintiff DAF is a charitable fund that helps several causes throughout the country, including providing funding for humanitarian issues (such as veteran's welfare associations and women's shelters), public works (such as museums, parks and zoos), and education (such as specialty schools in underserved communities). Its mission is critical.

11. Since 2012, DAF was advised by its registered investment adviser, Highland Capital Management, L.P., and its various subsidiaries, about where to invest. This relationship was governed by an Investment advisory Agreement.

12. At one point in 2017, HCM advised DAF to acquire 143,454,001 shares of HCLOF, with HCFA (a subsidiary of HCM) serving as the portfolio manager. DAF did so via a holding entity, Plaintiff CLO Holdco, Ltd.

13. On November 15, 2017, through a Subscription and Transfer Agreement, the DAF entered into an agreement with others to sell and transfer shares in HCLOF, wherein the DAF retained 49.02% in CLO Holdco.

14. Pursuant to that agreement, Harbourvest acquired the following interests in the following entities:

Harbourvest Dover Street IX Investment, L.P., acquired 35.49%;

Harbourvest 2017 Global AIF, L.P., acquired 2.42%;

Harbourvest 2017 lobal Fund, L.P., acquired 4.85%;

HV International VIII Secondary, L.P., acquired 6.5%; and

Harbourvest Skew Base AIF, L.P., acquired 0.72%;

for a total of 49.98% (altogether, the “Harbourvest interests”).

15. On or about October 16, 2019, Highland Capital Management filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in Delaware Bankruptcy Court, which was later transferred to the Northern District of Texas Bankruptcy Court, in the case styled *In Re: Highland Capital Management, L.P., Debtor*, Cause No. 19-34054, (the “HCM Bankruptcy” and the Court is the “Bankruptcy Court”).

The Harbourvest Settlement with Highland Capital Management in Bankruptcy

16. On April 8, 2020, Harbourvest submitted its proofs of claim in the HCM bankruptcy proceeding. Annexed to its proofs of claims was an explanation of the Proof of Claim and the basis therefor setting out various pre-petition allegations of wrongdoing by HCM. *See, e.g.*, Case No. 19-bk-34054, Doc. 1631-5.

17. The debtor, HCM, made an omnibus response to the proofs of claims, stating they were duplicative of each other, overstated, late, and otherwise meritless.

18. Harbourvest responded to the omnibus objections on September 11, 2020. *See* Cause No. 19-bk-34054, Doc. 1057.

19. Harbourvest represented that it had invested in HCLOF, purchasing 49.98% of HCLOF's outstanding shares.

20. Plaintiff CLO Holdco was and is also a 49.02% holder of HCLOF's member interests.

21. In its Omnibus Response, Harbourvest explained that its claims included unliquidated legal claims for fraud, fraud in the inducement, RICO violations under 18 U.S.C. 1964, among others (the "Harbourvest Claims"). *See* Cause No. 19-bk-34054, Doc. 1057.

22. The Harbourvest Claims centered on allegations that when Harbourvest was intending to invest in a pool of Collateralized Loan Obligations, or CLOs, that were then-managed by Acis Capital Management ("Acis"), a subsidiary of HCM, HCM failed to disclose key facts about ongoing litigation with a former employee, Josh Terry.

23. Harbourvest contended that HCM never sufficiently disclosed the underlying facts about the litigation with Terry, and HCM's then-intended strategy to fight Terry caused HCLOF to incur around \$15 million in legal fees and costs. It contended that had it known the nature of the lawsuit and how it would eventually turn out, Harbourvest never would have invested in HCLOF. *See* Cause No. 19-bk-34054, Doc. 1057.

24. HCLOF's portfolio manager is HCFA. HCM is the parent of HCFA and is managed by its General Partner, Strand Management, who employs Seery and acts on behalf of HCM.

25. Before acceding to the Harbourvest interests, HCM was a 0.6% holder of HCLOF interests.

26. While even assuming Harbourvest's underlying claims were valid as far as the lost \$15 million went, the true damage of the legal fees to Harbourvest would have been 49.98% of the HCLOF losses (i.e., less than \$7.5 million). Harbourvest claimed that it had lost over \$100 million in the HCLOF transaction due to fraud, which, after trebling under the racketeering statute, it claimed it was entitled to over \$300 million in damages.

27. In truth, as of September 2020, Harbourvest had indeed lost some \$52 million due to the alleged diminishing value of the HCLOF assets (largely due to the underperformance of the Acis entities³)—and the values were starting to recover.

28. HCM denied the allegations in the Bankruptcy Court. Other than the claim for waste of corporate assets of \$15 million, HCM at all times viewed the Harbourvest legal claims as being worth near zero and having no merit.

29. On December 23, 2020, HCM moved the Court to approve a settlement between itself and Harbourvest. No discovery had taken place between the parties, and Plaintiff did not have any notice of the settlement terms or other factors prior to the motion's filing (or even during its pendency) in order to investigate its rights.

30. HCM set the hearing right after the Christmas and New Year's holidays, almost ensuring that no party would have the time to scrutinize the underpinnings of the deal.

31. On January 14, 2021, the Bankruptcy Court held an evidentiary hearing and approved the settlement in a bench ruling, overruling the objections to the settlement.

³ Acis was being managed by Joshua Terry. JP Morgan had listed the four ACIS entities under his management as the four worst performers of the 1200 CLOs it evaluated.

32. An integral part of the settlement was allowing \$45 million in unsecured claims that, at the time of the agreement, were expected to net Harbourvest around 70 cents on the dollar. In other words, Harbourvest was expected to recover around \$31,500,000 from the allowed claims.

33. As part of the consideration for the \$45 million in allowed claims, Harbourvest agreed to transfer all of its interests in HCLOF to HCM or its designee.

34. HCM and Seery rationalized the settlement value by allocating \$22.5 million of the net value of the \$45 million in unsecured claims as consideration to purchase Harbourvest's interests in HCLOF, meaning, if 70% of the unsecured claims—i.e., \$31.5 million—was realized, because \$22.5 million of that would be allocated to the purchase price of the Harbourvest interests in HCLOF, the true “settlement” for Harbourvest's legal claims was closer to \$9 million.

35. Plaintiffs here are taking no position at this time about the propriety of settling the Harbourvest legal claims for \$9 million. That is for another day.

36. At the core of this lawsuit is the fact that HCM purchased the Harbourvest interests in HCLOF for \$22.5 million knowing that they were worth far more than that.

37. It has recently come to light that, upon information and belief, the Harbourvest interests, as of December 31, 2020, were worth in excess of \$41,750,000, and they have continued to go up in value.

38. On November 30, 2020, which was less than a month prior to the filing of the Motion to Approve the Settlement, the net asset value of those interests was over \$34.5 million. Plaintiffs were never made aware of that.

39. The change is due to how the net asset value, or NAV, was calculated. The means and methods for calculating the “net asset value” of the assets of HCLOF are subject to and

governed by the regulations passed by the SEC pursuant to the Adviser's Act, and by HCM's internal policies and procedures.

40. Typically, the value of the securities reflected by a market price quote.

41. However, the underlying securities in HCLOF are not liquid and had not been traded in a long while.

42. There not having been any contemporaneous market quotations that could be used in good faith to set the marks⁴ meant that other prescribed methods of assessing the value of the interests, such as the NAV, would have been the proper substitutes.

43. Seery testified that the fair market value of the Harbourvest HCLOF interests was \$22.5 million. Even allowing some leeway there, it was off the mark by a mile.

44. Given the artifice described herein, Seery and the entity Defendants had to know that the representation of the fair market value was false. But it does not appear that they disclosed it to Harbourvest to whom they owed fiduciary duties as the RIA in charge of HCLOF, and they certainly did not disclose the truth to the Plaintiff.

45. It is either the case that (i) Defendants conducted the proper analysis to obtain a current value of the assets but decided to use a far lower valuation in order to whitewash the settlement or enrich the bankruptcy estate; *or* (ii) Defendants never conducted the proper current valuation, and therefore baselessly represented what the current value of the assets was, despite knowingly having no reasonable basis for making such a claim.

46. For years HCM had such internal procedures and compliance protocols. HCM was not allowed by its own compliance officers to trade with an investor where HCM had superior knowledge about the value of the assets, for example. While Plaintiff has no reason to believe that

⁴ The term "mark" is shorthand for an estimated or calculated value for a non-publicly traded instrument.

those procedures were scrapped in recent months, it can only assume that they were either overridden improperly or circumvented wholesale.

47. Upon finalizing the Harbourvest Settlement Agreement and making representations to the Bankruptcy Court to the Plaintiffs about the value of the Harbourvest Interests, Seery and HCM had a duty to use current values and not rely on old valuations of the assets or the HCLOF interests.

48. Given Defendants' actual or constructive knowledge that they were purchasing Harbourvest's Interests in HCLOF for a less than 50% of what those interests were worth—Defendants owed Plaintiff a fiduciary duty not to purchase them for themselves.

49. Defendants should have either had HCLOF repurchase the interests with cash, or offer those interests to Plaintiff and the other members *pro rata*, before HCM agreed to purchase them all lock, stock and barrel, for no up-front cash.

50. Indeed, had Plaintiff been offered those interests, it would have happily purchased them and therefore would have infused over \$20 million in cash into the estate for the purpose of executing the Harbourvest Settlement.

51. That Defendants (and to perhaps a lesser extent, the Unsecured Creditors Committee (the "UCC")) agreed to pay \$22.5 million for the HCLOF assets, where they had previously not consented to any such expenditure by the estate on behalf of HCLOF, strongly indicates their awareness that they were purchasing assets for far below market value.

52. The above is the most reasonable and plausible explanation for why Defendants and the UCC forwent raising as much as \$22.5 million in cash now in favor of hanging on to the HCLOF assets.

53. Indeed, in January 2021 Seery threatened Ethen Powell that “[Judge Jernigan] is laughing at you” and “we are coming after you” in response to the latter’s attempt to exercise his right as beneficial holder of the CLO, and pointing out a conflict of interest in Seery’s plan to liquidate the funds.

54. HCM’s threat, made by Seery, is tantamount to not only a declaration that he intends to liquidate the funds regardless of whether the investors want to do so, and whether it is in their best interests, but also that HCM intends to leverage what it views as the Bankruptcy Court’s sympathy to evade accountability.

V.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION *Breaches of Fiduciary Duty*

55. Plaintiffs respectfully incorporate the foregoing factual averments as if fully set forth herein and further alleges the following:

56. HCM is a registered investment advisor and acts on behalf of HCFA. Both are fiduciaries to Plaintiffs.

57. The Advisers Act establishes an unwaivable federal fiduciary duty for investment advisers.⁵

⁵ See e.g., *SEC v. Capital Gains Research Bureau, Inc.*, 375 U.S. 180, 194 (1963); *Transamerica Mortg. Advisors (tama) v. Lewis*, 444 U.S. 11, 17 (1979) (“§ 206 establishes ‘federal fiduciary standards’ to govern the conduct of investment advisers.”); *Santa Fe Indus. v. Green*, 430 U.S. 462, 471, n.11 (1977) (in discussing *SEC v. Capital Gains*, stating that the Supreme Court’s reference to fraud in the “equitable” sense of the term was “premised on its recognition that Congress intended the Investment Advisers Act to establish federal fiduciary standards for investment advisers”). See also Investment Advisers Act Release No. 3060 (July 28, 2010) (“Under the Advisers Act, an adviser is a fiduciary whose duty is to serve the best interests of its clients, which includes an obligation not to subrogate clients’ interests to its own”) (citing Proxy Voting by Investment Advisers, Investment Advisers Act Release No. 2106 (Jan. 31, 2003)).

58. HCM and the DAF entered into an Amended and Restated Investment Advisory Agreement, executed between them on July 1, 2014 (the “RIA Agreement”). It renews annually and continued until the end of January 2021.

59. In addition to being the RIA to the DAF, HCM was appointed the DAF’s attorney-in-fact for certain actions, such as “to purchase or otherwise trade in Financial Instruments that have been approved by the General Partner.” RIA Agreement ¶ 4.

60. The RIA Agreement further commits HCM to value financial assets “in accordance with the then current valuation policy of the Investment Advisor [HCM], a copy of which will provided to the General Partner upon request.” RIA Agreement ¶ 5.

61. While HCM contracted for the recognition that it would be acting on behalf of others and could be in conflict with advice given the DAF, (RIA Agreement ¶ 12), nowhere did it purport to waive the fiduciary duties owed to the DAF not to trade as a principal in a manner that harmed the DAF.

62. HCFA owed a fiduciary duty to Holdco as an investor in HCLOF and to which HCFA was the portfolio manager. HCM owed a fiduciary duty to the DAF (and to Holdco as its subsidiary) pursuant to a written Advisory Agreement HCM and the DAF had where HCM agreed to provide sound investment advice and management functions.

63. As a registered investment adviser, HCM’s fiduciary duty is broad and applies to the entire advisor-client relationship.

64. The core of the fiduciary duty is to act in the best interest of their investors—the advisor must put the ends of the client before its own ends or the ends of a third party.

65. This is manifested in a duty of loyalty and a duty of utmost care. It also means that the RIA has to follow the terms of the company agreements and the regulations that apply to the investment vehicle.

66. The fiduciary duty that HCM and Seery owed to Plaintiff is predicated on trust and confidence. Section 204A of the Advisers Act requires investment advisors (whether SEC-registered or not) to establish, maintain, and enforce written policies and procedures reasonably designed to prevent the RIA from trading on material, non-public information. *See* 17 C.F.R. § 275.206(4)-7. That means that Plaintiff should be able to take Defendants at their word and not have to second guess or dig behind representations made by them.

67. The simple thesis of this claim is that Defendants HCFA and HCM breached their fiduciary duties by (i) insider trading with Harbourvest and concealing the rising NAV of the underlying assets—i.e., trading with Harbourvest on superior, non-public information that was neither revealed to Harbourvest nor to Plaintiff; (ii) concealing the value of the Harbourvest Interests; and (iii) diverting the investment opportunity in the Harbourvest entities to HCM (or its designee) without offering it to or making it available to Plaintiff or the DAF.

68. HCM, as part of its contractual advisory function with Plaintiffs, had expressly recommended the HCLOF investment to the DAF. Thus, diverting the opportunity for returns on its investment was an additional breach of fiduciary duty.

69. This violated a multitude of regulations under 27 C.F.R. part 275, in addition to Rules 10b-5 and 10b5-1. 17 CFR 240.10b5-1 (“Rule 10b5-1”) explains that one who trades while possessing non-public information is liable for insider trading, and they do not necessarily have to have *used* the specific inside information.

70. It also violated HCM’s own internal policies and procedures.

71. Also, the regulations impose obligations on Defendants to calculate a *current* valuation when communicating with an investor, such as what may or may not be taken into account, and what cannot pass muster as a current valuation. Upon information and belief, these regulations were not followed by the Defendants.

72. HCM's internal policies and procedures, which it promised to abide by both in the RIA Agreement and in its Form ADV SEC filing, provided for the means of properly calculating the value of the assets.

73. HCM either did not follow these policies, changed them to be out of compliance both with the Adviser Act regulations and its Form ADV representations, and/or simply misrepresented or concealed their results.

74. In so doing, because the fiduciary duty owed to Plaintiff is a broad one, and because Defendants' malfeasance directly implicates its relationship with Plaintiff, Defendants have breached the Advisers Act's fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff as part of their fiduciary relationship.⁶

75. At no time between agreeing with Harbourvest to the purchase of its interests and the court approval did Defendants disclose to either Harbourvest or to Plaintiff (and the Bankruptcy Court for that matter) that the purchase was at below 50% the current net asset value as well, and when they failed to offer Plaintiff (and the other members of HCLOF) their right to purchase the interests pro rata at such advantageous valuations. Plaintiff's lost opportunity to

⁶ See Advisers Act Release No. 4197 (Sept. 17, 2015) (Commission Opinion) ("[O]nce an investment Advisory relationship is formed, the Advisers Act does not permit an adviser to exploit that fiduciary relationship by defrauding his client in any investment transaction connected to the Advisory relationship."); see also *SEC v. Lauer*, No. 03-80612-CIV, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73026, at 90 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 24, 2008) ("Unlike the antifraud provisions of the Securities Act and the Exchange Act, Section 206 of the Advisers Act does not require that the activity be 'in the offer or sale of any' security or 'in connection with the purchase or sale of any security.'").

purchase has harmed Plaintiff. Plaintiff had been led to believe by the Defendants that the value of what was being purchased in the Harbourvest settlement by HCM (or its designee) was at fair market value. This representation, repeated again in the Bankruptcy Court during the Harbourvest confirmation, implicitly suggested that a proper current valuation had been performed.

76. Defendant's principal, Seery, testified in January 2021 that the then-current fair market value of Harbourvest's 49.98% interest in HCLOF was worth around \$22.5 million. But by then, it was worth almost double that amount and has continued to appreciate. Seery knew or should have known that fact because the value of some of the HCLOF assets had increased, and he had a duty to know the current value. His lack of actual knowledge, while potentially not overtly fraudulent, would nonetheless amount to a breach of fiduciary duty for acting without proper diligence and information that was plainly available.

77. Furthermore, HCLOF holds equity in MGM Studios and debt in CCS Medical via various CLO positions. But Seery, in his role as CEO of HCM, was made aware during an advisors meeting in December 2020 that Highland would have to restrict its trading in MGM because of its insider status due to activities that were likely to apply upward pressure on MGM's share price.

78. Furthermore, Seery controlled the Board of CCS Medical. And in or around October 2020, Seery was advocating an equatization that would have increased the value of the CCS securities by 25%, which was not reflected in the HCM report of the NAV of HCLOF's holdings.

79. Seery's knowledge is imputed to HCM.

80. Moreover, it is a breach of fiduciary duty to commit corporate waste, which is effectively what disposing of the HCLOF assets would constitute in a rising market, where there

is no demand for disposition by the investors (save for HCM, whose proper 0.6% interest could easily be sold to the DAF at fair value).

81. As holder of 0.6% of the HCLOF interests, and now assignee of the 49.98% Harbourvest Interests), HCM has essentially committed self-dealing by threatening to liquidate HCLOF now that it may be compelled to do so under its proposed liquidation plan, which perhaps inures to the short term goals of HCM but to the pecuniary detriment of the other holders of HCLOF whose upside will be prematurely truncated.

82. Seery and HCM should not be allowed to benefit from the breach of their fiduciary duties because doing so would also cause Plaintiffs irreparable harm. The means and methods of disposal would likely render the full scope of damages to the DAF not susceptible to specific calculation—particularly as they would relate to calculating the lost opportunity cost. Seery and HCM likely do not have the assets to pay a judgment to Plaintiffs that would be rendered, simply taking the lost appreciation of the HCLOF assets.

83. Defendants are thus liable for diverting a corporate opportunity or asset that would or should have been offered to Plaintiff and the other investors. Because federal law makes the duties invoked herein unwaivable, it is preposterous that HCM, as a 0.6% holder of HCLOF, deemed itself entitled to the all of the value and optionality of the below-market Harbourvest purchase.

84. Defendants cannot rely on any contractual provision that purports to waive this violation. Nothing in any agreement purports to permit, authorize or otherwise sanitize Defendants' self-dealing. All such provisions are void.

85. In the fourth quarter of 2020, Seery and HCM notified staff that they would be terminated on December 31, 2020. That termination was postponed to February 28, 2021.

Purchasing the Harbourvest assets without staffing necessary to be a functioning Registered Investment Advisor was a strategic reversal from prior filings that outlined canceling the CLO management contracts and allowing investors to replace Highland as manager.

86. Seery's compensation agreement with the UCC incentivizes him to expedite recoveries and to prevent transparency regarding the Harbourvest settlement.

87. What is more, Seery had previously testified that the management contracts for the funds—HCLOF included—were unprofitable, and that he intended to transfer them. But he later rejected offers to purchase those management contracts for fair value and instead decided to continue to manage the funds—which is what apparently gave rise to the Harbourvest Settlement, among others. He simultaneously rejected an offer for the Harbourvest assets of \$24 million, stating that they were worth much more than that.

88. Because of Defendants' malfeasance, Plaintiffs have lost over \$25 million in damages—a number that continues to rise—and the Defendants should not be able to obtain a windfall.

89. For the same reason, Defendants' malfeasance has also exposed HCLOF to a massive liability from Harbourvest since the assignment of those interests is now one that is likely unenforceable under the Advisers Act, Section 47(b), if there was unequal information.

90. HCM and HCFA are liable as principals for breach of fiduciary duty, as are the principals and compliance staff of each entity.

91. Plaintiffs seek disgorgement, damages, exemplary damages, attorneys' fees and costs. To the extent the Court determines that this claim had to have been brought derivatively on behalf of HCLOF, then Plaintiffs represent that any pre-suit demand would have been futile since asking HCM to bring suit against its principal, Seery, would have been futile.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Breach of HCLOF Company Agreement
(By Holdco against HCLOF, HCM and HCFA)

92. Plaintiffs respectfully incorporate the foregoing factual averments as if fully set forth herein and further alleges the following:

93. On November 15, 2017, the members of HCLOF, along with HCLOF and HCFA, executed the *Members Agreement Relating to the Company* (the “Company Agreement”).

94. The Company Agreement governs the rights and duties of the members of HCLOF.

95. Section 6.2 of HCLOF Company Agreement provides that when a member “other than ... CLO Holdco [Plaintiff] or a Highland Affiliate,” intends to sell its interest in HCLOF to a third party (i.e., not to an affiliate of the selling member), then the other members have the first right of refusal to purchase those interests pro rata for the same price that the member has agreed to sell.

96. Here, despite the fact that Harbourvest agreed to sell its interests in HCLOF for \$22.5 million when they were worth more than double that, Defendants did not offer Plaintiff the chance to buy its pro rata share of those interests at the same agreed price of \$22.5 million (adjusted pro rata).

97. The transfer and sale of the interests to HCM were accomplished as part of the Harbourvest Settlement which was approved by the Bankruptcy Court.

98. Plaintiff was not informed of the fact that Harbourvest had offered its shares to Defendant HCM for \$22.5 million—which was under 50% of their true value.

99. Plaintiff was not offered the right to purchase its pro rata share of the Harbourvest interests prior to the agreement being struck or prior to court approval being sought.

100. Had Plaintiff been allowed to do so, it would have obtained the interests with a net equity value over their purchase price worth in excess of \$20 million.

101. No discovery or opportunity to investigate was afforded Plaintiff prior to lodging an objection in the Bankruptcy Court.

102. Plaintiff is entitled to specific performance or, alternatively, disgorgement, constructive trust, damages, attorneys' fees and costs.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
Negligence
(By the DAF and CLO Holdco against HCM and HCFA)

103. Plaintiffs respectfully incorporate the foregoing factual averments as if fully set forth herein, and further alleges the following:

104. Plaintiffs incorporate the foregoing causes of action and note that all the foregoing violations were breaches of the common law duty of care imposed by law on each of Seery, HCFA and HCM.

105. Each of these Defendants should have known that their actions were violations of the Advisers Act, HCM's internal policies and procedures, the Company Agreement, or all three.

106. Seery and HCM owed duties of care to Plaintiffs to follow HCM's internal policies and procedures regarding both the propriety and means of trading with a customer [Harbourvest], the propriety and means of trading as a principal in an account but in a manner adverse to another customer [the DAF and Holdco], and the proper means of valuing the CLOs and other assets held by HCLOF.

107. It would be foreseeable that failing to disclose the current value of the assets in the HCLOF would impact Plaintiffs negatively in a variety of ways.

108. It would be reasonably foreseeable that failing to correctly and accurately calculate the current net asset value of the market value of the interests would cause Plaintiffs to value the Harbourvest Interests differently.

109. It would be reasonably foreseeable that referring to old and antiquated market quotations and/or valuations of the HCLOF assets or interests would result in a mis-valuation of HCLOF and, therefore, a mis-valuation of the Harbourvest Interests.

110. Likewise, it would have been foreseeable that Plaintiff's failure to give Plaintiff the opportunity to purchase the Harbourvest shares at a \$22.5 million valuation would cause Plaintiff damages. Defendants knew that the value of those assets was rising. They further knew or should have known that whereas those assets were sold to HCM for an allowance of claims to be funded in the future, selling them to Plaintiff would have provided the estate with cash funds.

111. Defendants' negligence foreseeably and directly caused Plaintiff harm.

112. Plaintiff is thus entitled to damages.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organizations Act
(CLO Holdco and DAF against HCM)

113. Plaintiffs respectfully incorporate the foregoing factual averments as if fully set forth herein, and further alleges the following:

114. Defendants are liable for violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ("RICO") Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.*, for the conduct of an enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity.

115. HCLOF constitutes an enterprise under the RICO Act. Additionally, or in the alternative, HCM, HCLA, and HCLOF constituted an association-in-fact enterprise. The purpose of the association-in-fact was the perpetuation of Seery's position at HCM and using the

Harbourvest settlement as a vehicle to enrich persons other than the HCLOF investors, including Holdco and the DAF, and the perpetuation of HCM's holdings in collateralized loan obligations owned by HCLOF, while attempting to deny Plaintiffs the benefit of its rights of ownership.

116. The association-in-fact was bound by informal and formal connections for years prior to the elicited purpose, and then changed when HCM joined it in order to achieve the association's illicit purpose. For example, HCM is the parent and control person over HCFA, which is the portfolio manager of HCLOF pursuant to a contractual agreement—both are registered investment advisors and provide advisory and management services to HCLOF.

117. Defendants injured Plaintiffs through their continuous course of conduct of the HCM-HCLA-HCLOF association-in-fact enterprise. HCM's actions (performed through Seery and others) constitute violations of the federal wire fraud, mail fraud, fraud in connection with a case under Title 11, and/or securities fraud laws, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)(B) and (D).

118. HCM operated in such a way as to violate insider trading rules and regulations when it traded with Harbourvest while it had material, non-public information that it had not supplied to Harbourvest or to Plaintiffs.

119. In or about November 2020, HCM and Harbourvest entered into discussions about settling the Harbourvest Claims. Seery's conduct of HCLOF and HCLA on behalf of HCM through the interstate mails and/or wires caused HCM to agree to the purchase of Harbourvest's interests in HCLOF.

120. On or about each of September 30, 2020, through December 31, 2020, Seery, through his conduct of the enterprise, utilized the interstate wires and/or mails to obtain or arrive at valuations of the HCLOF interests. Seery's conduct of the enterprise caused them to cease

sending the valuation reports to Plaintiffs, which eventually allowed Plaintiffs to be misled into believing that Seery had properly valued the interests.

121. On or about September 30, 2020, Seery transmitted or caused to be transmitted through the interstate wires information to HCLOF investors from HCM (via HCFA), including Harbourvest, regarding the value of HCLOF interests and underlying assets.

122. Additionally, Seery operated HCM in such a way that he concealed the true value of the HCLOF interests by utilizing the interstate wires and mails to transmit communications to the court in the form of written representations on or about December 23, 2020, and then further transmitted verbal representations of the current market value (the vastly understated one) on January 14, 2021, during live testimony.

123. However, Harbourvest was denied the full picture and the true value of the underlying portfolio. At the end of October and November of 2020, HCM had updated the net asset values of the HCLOF portfolio. According to sources at HCM at the time, the HCLOF assets were worth north of \$72,969,492 as of November 30, 2020. Harbourvest's share of that would have been \$36,484,746.

124. The HCLOF net asset value had reached \$86,440,024 as of December 31, 2021, which means that by the time Seery was testifying in the Bankruptcy Court on January 14, 2021, the fair market value of the Harbourvest Assets was \$22.5 million, when it was actually closer to \$43,202,724. Seery, speaking on behalf of HCM, knew of the distinction in value.

125. On January 14, 2021, Seery also testified that he (implying HCM, HCLA and HCLOF) had valued the Harbourvest Assets at their current valuation and at fair market value. This was not true because the valuation that was used and testified to was ancient. The ostensible purpose of this concealment was to induce Plaintiff and other interest holdings to take no action.

126. In supporting HCM’s motion to the Bankruptcy Court to approve the Harbourvest Settlement, Seery omitted the fact that HCM was purchasing the interests at a massive discount, which would violate the letter and spirit of the Adviser’s Act.

127. Seery was informed in late December 2020 at an in-person meeting in Dallas to which Seery had to fly that HCLOF and HCM had to suspend trading in MGM Studios’ securities because Seery had learned from James Dondero, who was on the Board of MGM, of a potential purchase of the company. The news of the MGM purchase should have caused Seery to revalue the HCLOF investment in MGM.

128. In or around October 2020, Seery (who controls the Board of CSS Medical) was pursuing “equatization” of CSS Medical’s debt, which would have increased the value of certain securities by 25%. In several communications through the U.S. interstate wires and/or mails, and with Plaintiffs, and the several communications with Harbourvest during the negotiations of the settlement, Seery failed to disclose these changes which were responsible in part for the ever-growing value of the HCLOF CLO portfolio.

129. Seery was at all relevant times operating as an agent of HCM.

130. This series of related violations of the wire fraud, mail fraud, and securities fraud laws, in connection with the HCM bankruptcy, constitute a continuing pattern and practice of racketeering for the purpose of winning a windfall for HCM and himself--a nearly \$30,000,000 payday under the confirmation agreement.

131. The federal RICO statute makes it actionable for one’s conduct of an enterprise to include “fraud in connection with a [bankruptcy case]”. The Advisers’ Act antifraud provisions require full transparency and accountability to an advisers’ investors and clients and does not require a showing of reliance or materiality. The wire fraud provision likewise is violated when,

as here, the interstate wires are used as part of a “scheme or artifice ... for obtaining money or property by means of false ... pretenses, [or] representations[.]”

132. Accordingly, because Defendants’ conduct violated the wire fraud and mail fraud laws, and the Advisers’ Act antifraud provisions, and their acts and omissions were in connection with the HCM Bankruptcy proceedings under Title 11, they are sufficient to bring such conduct within the purview of the RICO civil action provisions, 18 U.S.C. § 1964.

133. Plaintiffs are thus entitled to damages, treble damages, attorneys’ fees and costs of suit, in addition to all other injunctive or equitable relief to which they are justly entitled.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
Tortious Interference
(CLO Holdco against HCM)

134. Plaintiff respectfully incorporates the foregoing factual averments as if fully set forth herein and further alleges the following:

135. At all relevant times, HCM owned a 0.6% interest in HCLOF.

136. At all relevant times, Seery and HCM knew that Plaintiff had specific rights in HCLOF under the Company Agreement, § 6.2.

137. Section 6.2 of HCLOF Company agreement provides that when a member “other than ... CLO Holdco [Plaintiff] or a Highland Affiliate,” intends to sell its interest in HCLOF to a third party (i.e., not an affiliate of the member), then the other members have the first right of refusal to purchase those interests pro rata for the same price that the member has agreed to sell.

138. HCM, through Seery, tortiously interfered with Plaintiff’s contractual rights with HCLOF by, among other things, diverting the Harbourvest Interests in HCLOF to HCM without giving HCLOF or Plaintiff the option to purchase those assets at the same favorable price that HCM obtained them.

139. HCM and Seery tortiously interfered with Plaintiff's contractual rights with HCLOF by, among other things, misrepresenting the fair market value as \$22.5 million and concealing the current value of those interests.

140. But for HCM and Seery's tortious interference, Plaintiff would have been able to acquire the Harbourvest Interests at a highly favorable price. HCM and Seery's knowledge of the rights and intentional interference with these rights has caused damage to Plaintiff CLO Holdco.

141. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to damages from HCM and Seery, as well as exemplary damages.

VI.

JURY DEMAND

142. Plaintiff demands trial by jury on all claims so triable.

VII.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

143. Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully pray that the Court enter judgment in its favor and against Defendants, jointly and severally, for:

- a. Actual damages;
- b. Disgorgement;
- c. Treble damages;
- d. Exemplary and punitive damages;
- e. Attorneys' fees and costs as allowed by common law, statute or contract;
- f. A constructive trust to avoid dissipation of assets;
- g. All such other relief to which Plaintiff is justly entitled.

Dated: April 12, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

SBAITI & COMPANY PLLC

/s/ Mazin A. Sbaiti

Mazin A. Sbaiti

Texas Bar No. 24058096

Jonathan Bridges

Texas Bar No. 24028835

JPMorgan Chase Tower

2200 Ross Avenue – Suite 4900W

Dallas, TX 75201

T: (214) 432-2899

F: (214) 853-4367

E: mas@sbaitilaw.com

jeb@sbaitilaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 12

GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

IN RE:)	
)	Chapter 11
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,)	
L.P.)	Case No.
)	19-34054-sgj11
Debtor.)	
-----)	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,)	
L.P.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Adversary
vs.)	Proceeding No.
)	21-03000-sgj
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT)	
FUND ADVISORS, L.P.; NEXPOINT)	
ADVISORS, L.P.; HIGHLAND)	
INCOME FUND; NEXPOINT)	
STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES FUND;)	
NEXPOINT CAPITAL, INC.; and)	
CLO HoldCo, LTD.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
-----)	

VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF Grant SCOTT

Thursday, 21st of January, 2021

Reported by: Lisa A. Wheeler, RPR, CRR

Job No: 188910

<p>Page 2</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 January 21, 2021</p> <p>3 2:02 p.m.</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 Videoconference deposition of Grant</p> <p>7 SCOTT, pursuant to the Federal Rules of</p> <p>8 Civil Procedure before Lisa A. Wheeler,</p> <p>9 RPR, CRR, a Notary Public of the State of</p> <p>10 North Carolina. The court reporter</p> <p>11 reported the proceeding remotely and the</p> <p>12 witness was present via videoconference.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 3</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 REMOTE APPEARANCES:</p> <p>3 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES</p> <p>4 Attorneys for Debtor</p> <p>5 780 Third Avenue</p> <p>6 New York, NY 10017</p> <p>7 BY: JOHN MORRIS, ESQ.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 LATHAM & WATKINS</p> <p>10 Attorneys for UBS</p> <p>11 885 Third Avenue</p> <p>12 New York, NY 10022</p> <p>13 BY: SHANNON McLAUGHLIN, ESQ.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 SIDLEY AUSTIN</p> <p>16 Attorneys for the Creditors Committee</p> <p>17 2021 McKinney Avenue</p> <p>18 Dallas, TX 75201</p> <p>19 BY: PENNY REID, ESQ.</p> <p>20 ALYSSA RUSSELL, ESQ.</p> <p>21 PAIGE MONTGOMERY, ESQ.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p>Page 4</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 REMOTE APPEARANCES: (Continued)</p> <p>3 KING & SPALDING</p> <p>4 Attorneys for Highland CLO Funding, Ltd.</p> <p>5 500 West 2nd Street</p> <p>6 Austin, TX 78701</p> <p>7 BY: REBECCA MATSUMURA, ESQ.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 K&L GATES</p> <p>10 Attorneys for Highland Capital Management</p> <p>11 Fund Advisors, L.P., et al.</p> <p>12 4350 Lassiter at North Hills Avenue</p> <p>13 Raleigh, NC 27609</p> <p>14 BY: A. LEE HOGEWOOD, III, ESQ.</p> <p>15 EMILY MATHER, ESQ.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 HELLER DRAPER & HORN</p> <p>18 Attorneys for The Dugaboy Investment Trust</p> <p>19 and The Get Good Trust</p> <p>20 650 Poydras Street</p> <p>21 New Orleans, LA 70130</p> <p>22 BY: MICHAEL LANDIS, ESQ.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 5</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 REMOTE APPEARANCES: (Continued)</p> <p>3 KANE RUSSELL COLEMAN & LOGAN</p> <p>4 Attorneys for Defendant CLO HoldCo Limited</p> <p>5 Bank of America Plaza</p> <p>6 901 Main Street</p> <p>7 Dallas, TX 75202</p> <p>8 BY: BRIAN CLARK, ESQ.</p> <p>9 JOHN KANE, ESQ.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 ALSO PRESENT: La Asia Canty</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

Page 6

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 G R A N T S C O T T ,

3 called as a witness, having been duly sworn

4 by a Notary Public, was examined and

5 testified as follows:

6 MR. MORRIS: Good afternoon. My

7 name is John Morris. I'm an attorney with

8 Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones, a law firm

9 who represents the debtor in the bankruptcy

10 known as In Re: Highland Capital

11 Management, L.P., and we're here today for

12 the deposition of Grant Scott.

13 Before I begin, I would just like to

14 have confirmation on the record that

15 everybody here who's representing their

16 respective parties agrees that this

17 deposition can be used in evidence in any

18 subsequent hearing, notwithstanding the

19 fact that it's being conducted remotely,

20 and that the witness is not in the same

21 room as the court reporter.

22 Does anybody have an objection to

23 the admissibility of the transcript subject

24 to any reservation of -- of actual

25 objections on the record to using this

Page 8

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 the -- the deposition six to eight years ago,

3 do you have a recollection as to what that was

4 about?

5 A. Yeah. It was a -- it was a patent I

6 wrote for Samsung Electronics.

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. And as being the person that I --

9 that wrote it and the patent was in litigation,

10 not -- not being handled by me, but by virtue

11 of having written the patent, I was -- I was

12 deposed --

13 Q. Okay. So you --

14 A. -- on the -- on the patent.

15 Q. Okay. So you've had a little bit of

16 experience with depositions. But just

17 generally speaking, I'm going to ask you a

18 series of questions. It's very important that

19 you allow me to finish my question before you

20 begin your answer.

21 Is that fair?

22 A. Absolutely.

23 Q. And I will certainly try to extend

24 the same courtesy to you, but if I -- if I step

25 on your words, will you let me know that?

Page 7

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 transcript going forward?

3 Okay. Nobody's spoken up, so I --

4 I'd like to begin.

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. MORRIS:

7 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Scott. As I

8 mentioned, my name is John Morris, and we're

9 here for your deposition today. Have you ever

10 been deposed before?

11 A. On two occasions.

12 Q. And -- and when did the -- when did

13 those depositions take place?

14 A. This past October and maybe six to

15 eight years ago.

16 Q. Okay. Can you just tell me

17 generally what the subject matter was of the

18 deposition this past October.

19 A. It was relating to Jim Dondero's --

20 it was a family law issue in -- in -- with

21 respect to Jim Dondero.

22 Q. Okay. And did you testify in a

23 courtroom, or was it a deposition like this?

24 A. I -- right here, actually.

25 Q. Okay. Super. And -- and what about

Page 9

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. And if there's anything that I ask

4 that you don't understand, will you let me know

5 that as well?

6 A. Yes. I'll try -- I'll do my best.

7 Q. Okay. So this is a virtual

8 deposition. We're not in the same room. I am

9 going to be showing you documents today. The

10 documents will be put up on the screen. This

11 isn't a -- a trick of any kind. If at any time

12 you see a document up on the screen and either

13 you believe or you have any reason to want to

14 read other portions of the document, will you

15 let me know that?

16 A. Yes, I -- yes, I will. Uh-huh.

17 Q. With respect to the Dondero family

18 matter, I really don't want to go into the

19 substance of that, but I do want to know

20 whether you testified voluntarily in that

21 matter or whether you -- whether you testified

22 pursuant to subpoena.

23 A. I would have done that, but the

24 first time I found out about it was a -- was a

25 subpoena that I received. I wasn't given the

Page 10

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 choice.

3 Q. Okay. And do you recall who served

4 the subpoena on you? Actually, let me ask a

5 different question because I'm really not

6 interested in the -- in the details.

7 Did Mr. Dondero serve that subpoena

8 on you or did somebody else?

9 A. His counsel for his ex-wife.

10 Q. Mr. -- so -- so the lawyer acting on

11 behalf of Mr. Dondero's ex-wife served you with

12 the subpoena?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Okay. You're familiar with an

15 entity called CLO HoldCo Limited; is that

16 right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Do you know what that entity is?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What -- what -- can you describe for

21 me what CLO HoldCo Limited is.

22 A. It's a holding company of assets

23 including collateralized loan obligation-type

24 assets. That's a portion of the overall

25 portfolio. It's an organization that is

Page 12

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 role of director of CLO HoldCo Limited, was

3 that entity already in existence?

4 A. I believe so. I'm not certain. I'm

5 not certain.

6 Q. What are your duties and

7 responsibilities as a director of CLO HoldCo

8 Limited?

9 A. Well, my day-to-day responsibilities

10 are to interface with -- with the manager of

11 the -- of the assets of CLO. I do have some

12 role in -- with respect to some of the entities

13 that are -- I -- I have a limited role with

14 respect to a subset of the charitable

15 foundations that receive money from the CLO

16 HoldCo structure, which is commonly referred to

17 as the DAF. There's -- sometimes those are

18 used interchangeably.

19 Q. What terms are used interchangeably?

20 A. Well, the DAF and CLO HoldCo are

21 frequently -- by -- by other people they're --

22 it's the short -- it's the -- I guess it's

23 easier to use the acronym DAF than CLO HoldCo

24 Limited, so I'm frequently having to -- there

25 is a DAF entity so -- that's above -- above CLO

Page 11

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 integrated with other entities as part of a

3 charitable -- loosely what we -- what we refer

4 to as a charitable foundation equivalent.

5 Yeah.

6 Q. All right. We'll -- we'll get into

7 some detail about the corporate structure in a

8 moment. Do you personally play any role at CLO

9 HoldCo Limited?

10 A. Yes. My technical title is

11 director, but I -- I don't necessarily know

12 specifically what that title means other than I

13 act, as I understand it, as -- as a trustee for

14 those -- for those assets.

15 Q. And where did you get that

16 understanding?

17 A. Approximately ten years ago from the

18 group that -- that set up the hierarchy.

19 Q. And which group set up the

20 hierarchy?

21 A. Employees at Jim Don- -- as I

22 understand it, employees of Highland along with

23 outside counsel, as I understand it, and also,

24 I guess, input from -- from Jim Dondero.

25 Q. At the time that you assumed the

Page 13

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 in terms of the management, and so it's

3 frequently confusing and I'm having to clarify

4 at times which entity we're talking about,

5 but -- but other parties frequently use those

6 terms interchangeably.

7 Q. Okay.

8 MR. MORRIS: Lisa, when we use the

9 phrase DAF, because you'll hear that a lot,

10 it's all caps, D-A-F.

11 BY MR. MORRIS:

12 Q. You mentioned that you interface

13 with the manager of assets of CLOs. Do I have

14 that right?

15 A. Well, of all the assets.

16 Q. Okay. Who is the manager of the

17 assets that you're referring to?

18 A. Highland Capital Management.

19 Q. Highland Capital Management manages

20 all of the assets -- withdrawn.

21 Is it your understanding that

22 Highland Capital Management manages all the

23 assets that are owned by CLO HoldCo Limited?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Who makes the investment decisions

Page 14

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited?

3 A. Highland -- those managers that you

4 mentioned.

5 Q. Okay. I didn't mention anybody in

6 particular.

7 A. Oh, I'm sorry. The -- the -- the

8 money manager -- could you repeat that

9 question? I'm sorry. I'm so sorry.

10 Q. Can you just -- can you just

11 identify for me the person who makes investment

12 decisions on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited.

13 A. It's -- well, it's -- it's persons

14 as I understand it. I inter- -- interface with

15 a -- with a group, but it's -- it's Highland

16 Capital employee -- Highland Capital Management

17 employees.

18 Q. Okay. Can you just name any of

19 them, please.

20 A. Hunter Covitz, Jim Dondero. Mark

21 Okada's no longer there, but I believe he was

22 involved, and there are others that I interface

23 with.

24 Q. Can you -- can you recall the name

25 of anybody other than Mr. Okada and Mr. Dondero

Page 16

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Q. Is it fair to say that you do not

3 make decisions, investment decisions, on behalf

4 of CLO HoldCo Limited?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Does CLO HoldCo Limited have any

7 employees that you know of?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Does CLO HoldCo have any --

10 withdrawn.

11 Does CLO HoldCo Limited have any

12 officers that you know of?

13 A. No.

14 Q. So am I correct that you're the only

15 representative in the world of CLO HoldCo in

16 terms of being a director, officer, or

17 employee?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Do you receive any compensation from

20 CLO HoldCo for your services as the director?

21 A. I do now.

22 Q. When did that begin?

23 A. I believe in the middle of 2012.

24 Q. Okay. And had you served as a

25 director prior to that time without

Page 15

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 and Mr. Covitz?

3 A. Yeah. Over the years I've worked

4 with Tim Cournoyer, Thomas Surgent, but I

5 think -- I think that's the core -- the core

6 group.

7 Q. All right. And is there anybody

8 within that core group who has the final

9 decision-making authority concerning the

10 investments in CLO HoldCo Limited?

11 A. I don't -- I don't know. I'm sorry.

12 Say that again. I just want to -- I'm sorry.

13 I'm trying to be -- I'm not trying to -- I'm

14 trying to be --

15 Q. I understand. And --

16 A. Sorry. If you could just repeat it.

17 Q. Sure. Is there any particular

18 person who has the final decision-making

19 authority for investments that are being made

20 on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited?

21 A. Amongst that group I am -- I am not

22 sure.

23 Q. Okay. So are there any other

24 directors of CLO HoldCo besides yourself?

25 A. No.

Page 17

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 compensation?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And have you been the sole director

5 of CLO HoldCo Limited since the time of your

6 appointment approximately ten years ago?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Nobody else has served in that

9 capacity; is that right?

10 A. That is correct.

11 Q. There have been no employees or

12 officers of that entity during the time that

13 you've served as director, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Do you know who formed CLO HoldCo

16 Limited?

17 A. I do not.

18 Q. Do you know why CLO HoldCo Limited

19 was formed?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. Can you explain to me why -- your

22 understanding as to why CLO HoldCo was formed.

23 A. So as I understand things, Jim

24 Dondero wanted to create a charitable

25 foundation-like entity or entities, and tax

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 people particularly, I guess, finance people,</p> <p>3 lawyers, they created this network of entities</p> <p>4 to carry out that charitable goal. At one</p> <p>5 point, I thought it was a novel type of</p> <p>6 institution, if you want to call it, or a</p> <p>7 novel -- novel type of group of entities, but</p> <p>8 over time, I came to understand that although</p> <p>9 not cookie cutter, it -- it follows a general</p> <p>10 arrangement of entities for legal and tax</p> <p>11 purposes, compliance purposes, IRS purposes,</p> <p>12 various insulating purposes to maintain -- or</p> <p>13 to meet the necessary requisites to carry out</p> <p>14 that charitable function.</p> <p>15 Q. When did you come to that</p> <p>16 understanding?</p> <p>17 A. Over the last couple of years. I</p> <p>18 periodically have to refresh my recollection.</p> <p>19 It's -- it's fairly complex.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. In your capacity as the sole</p> <p>21 director of CLO HoldCo Limited, do you report</p> <p>22 to anybody?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Other than interfacing with the</p> <p>25 manager of the assets of the CLO, do you have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 any other duties and responsibilities as a</p> <p>3 director of CLO HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>4 A. Yes. Sorry. My mouth is a little</p> <p>5 dry.</p> <p>6 Q. By the way, if you ever need to take</p> <p>7 a break, just let me know.</p> <p>8 A. Okay. Thank you. Now I forgot your</p> <p>9 question. The -- the -- the --</p> <p>10 Q. I understand.</p> <p>11 A. The answer -- the -- the answer is</p> <p>12 yes. I -- why don't you ask -- ask your</p> <p>13 question again. I'm sorry.</p> <p>14 Q. Sure. Other than interfacing with</p> <p>15 the manager of the assets of the CLO, do you</p> <p>16 have any other duties and responsibilities as</p> <p>17 the sole director of CLO HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. So Highland Capital because of</p> <p>19 its -- the way it's set up to manage or service</p> <p>20 CLO HoldCo and the DAF, it has a relatively</p> <p>21 large group of people that I have to interface</p> <p>22 with to do everything from -- everything from</p> <p>23 soup to nuts. Finances and the money</p> <p>24 management is one aspect, but most of my</p> <p>25 time -- on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 most of my time is spent working with the</p> <p>3 various compliance and other people for</p> <p>4 addressing issues of get- -- you know, getting</p> <p>5 taxes filed. It runs -- it runs the gamut of</p> <p>6 every aspect of the organization being -- being</p> <p>7 handled by Highland.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. You know, unlike -- unlike my</p> <p>10 financial -- unlike a financial planner that</p> <p>11 might, you know, manage assets, they -- they do</p> <p>12 it all, and I interface with them regularly to</p> <p>13 maintain -- mostly to deal with compliance</p> <p>14 issues.</p> <p>15 Q. Who's the com- -- is there a person</p> <p>16 who's in charge of compliance?</p> <p>17 A. I believe Thomas Surgent. I</p> <p>18 mentioned him. I believe he also has that</p> <p>19 role, but it's -- you know, they do have</p> <p>20 turnover, I guess, in that. It's -- I guess</p> <p>21 they refer to it as the back office. I've</p> <p>22 heard that term be used, but -- basically, it's</p> <p>23 a large number of people that have changed over</p> <p>24 time, but it's -- it's more -- I believe it's</p> <p>25 more than one collectively.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. How much time do you devote -- you</p> <p>3 know, can you estimate either on a weekly or a</p> <p>4 monthly basis how many -- how much time do you</p> <p>5 devote to serving as the director of CLO HoldCo</p> <p>6 Limited?</p> <p>7 A. I thought about that. Well, let --</p> <p>8 let's put it this way: There was the</p> <p>9 prebankruptcy time I spent per day, and then</p> <p>10 there was the postbankruptcy time I've spent</p> <p>11 per -- per -- or per week -- excuse me, or</p> <p>12 per -- I've estimated it as probably a day --</p> <p>13 it's so intermittent it's -- it's hard, okay?</p> <p>14 It's -- I don't dedicate my Mondays to only</p> <p>15 doing that and then Tuesday through Friday I</p> <p>16 don't, right? I -- it's -- I have to piece</p> <p>17 together everything that occurs during the</p> <p>18 week. There might be some weeks where I don't</p> <p>19 have any contact. There might be every day of</p> <p>20 the week I have multiple contact. There may be</p> <p>21 days where from morning to night there is so</p> <p>22 much contact, it precludes me from doing</p> <p>23 anything else meaningfully. So -- but I would</p> <p>24 estimate it's probably three or four -- maybe</p> <p>25 three days, four days a month when things are</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 going well.</p> <p>3 Q. And -- and I think you -- you</p> <p>4 testified just now that there was kind of a</p> <p>5 difference between prebankruptcy and</p> <p>6 postbankruptcy. Do I have that right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And can you tell me -- is it fair to</p> <p>9 say that before the bankruptcy, you didn't</p> <p>10 devote much time to CLO HoldCo, or do I have</p> <p>11 that wrong?</p> <p>12 A. Well, I -- just the time that --</p> <p>13 that I mentioned just -- I'm sorry. The -- the</p> <p>14 time I just mentioned now when you asked me,</p> <p>15 that was the pre period. Excuse me. I haven't</p> <p>16 talked about the postbankruptcy period.</p> <p>17 Q. So are you -- are you -- are you</p> <p>18 devoting more time or less time since the</p> <p>19 bankruptcy?</p> <p>20 A. Much more.</p> <p>21 Q. Much more since the bankruptcy</p> <p>22 filing?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And so why did the bankruptcy filing</p> <p>25 cause you to spend more time as a director of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 CLO HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>3 A. Well, initially, and this would</p> <p>4 be -- this would be late 2019, it was --</p> <p>5 aft- -- after the bankruptcy was -- was filed</p> <p>6 and I obtained counsel, who are on the phone</p> <p>7 now -- or in this deposition now, excuse me,</p> <p>8 that was -- that transition occurred because</p> <p>9 CLO was a debtor -- excuse me, a creditor to --</p> <p>10 to the debtor and had to take steps to</p> <p>11 establish its -- its claim. So if I understand</p> <p>12 the -- things correctly, the -- the debtor</p> <p>13 identified as part of the filing -- I don't</p> <p>14 know how bankruptcy works, but if I under- --</p> <p>15 if my recollection is correct, there's a</p> <p>16 hierarchy from biggest to smallest, and we were</p> <p>17 relatively high up. And when I say we or I,</p> <p>18 I -- I just mean CLO was relatively high up.</p> <p>19 And so initially, for the first period of so</p> <p>20 many months, the -- the exclusive focus was on</p> <p>21 our position as a creditor -- a creditor having</p> <p>22 a certain claim against a debtor.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you describe for me your</p> <p>24 understanding of the nature of the claim</p> <p>25 against the debtor.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. It was various obligations that were</p> <p>3 owed to -- to CLO, things that had been</p> <p>4 previously donated or -- or agreements that had</p> <p>5 been set up that transferred certain assets,</p> <p>6 and it was basically the -- the -- the amounts</p> <p>7 were derived from those sorts of transactions.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. You're a patent lawyer; is</p> <p>9 that right?</p> <p>10 A. I -- I'm exclusively a patent</p> <p>11 attorney, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Have you been a patent lawyer on an</p> <p>13 exclusive basis since the time you graduated</p> <p>14 from law school?</p> <p>15 A. From law school, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Can you just describe for me</p> <p>17 generally your educational background.</p> <p>18 A. So I'm an electrical engineer by</p> <p>19 training. I graduated from the University of</p> <p>20 Virginia in 1984. I then went to graduate</p> <p>21 school at the University of Illinois. I</p> <p>22 received my master's degree in 1986, and then I</p> <p>23 immediately joined IBM Research at the Thomas</p> <p>24 Watson Institute in New York where I was a --</p> <p>25 my title was research scientist, but I was -- I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 guess I was more of a research engineer, if</p> <p>3 that matters. And I did that until I</p> <p>4 transitioned -- or I began law school in the</p> <p>5 fall of 1988, and then I graduated law school</p> <p>6 in May of 1991.</p> <p>7 Q. And where did you go to law school?</p> <p>8 A. University of North Carolina.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you have any formal training in</p> <p>10 investing or finance?</p> <p>11 A. I do not.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you hold yourself out as an</p> <p>13 expert in any field of investment?</p> <p>14 A. None -- none at all.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you had any formal training</p> <p>16 with respect to compliance issues? You</p> <p>17 mentioned compliance issues earlier.</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. Now, do you have any knowledge about</p> <p>20 compliance rules or regulations?</p> <p>21 A. Minimal that I've -- that have</p> <p>22 occurred organically but -- but generally, no.</p> <p>23 Q. You don't hold yourself out as an</p> <p>24 expert in com- -- in the area of compliance,</p> <p>25 correct?</p>

Page 26

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. No. No. I'm -- no.

3 Q. Do you have any particular

4 investment philosophy or strategy?

5 MR. CLARK: I'm going to object to

6 the form of the question. And, John,

7 can -- can we get an agreement that -- I

8 know you were objecting just simply on the

9 form basis yesterday -- that objection to

10 form is sufficient today?

11 MR. MORRIS: Sure.

12 MR. CLARK: Okay. And I object to

13 form. Grant, you can answer to the extent

14 you can.

15 THE WITNESS: I forget the question

16 now that you interrupted. I'm sorry.

17 BY MR. MORRIS:

18 Q. So -- so -- and I'm going to ask a

19 different question because in hindsight, that's

20 a good objection.

21 In your capacity as the director

22 of -- withdrawn.

23 Do the employees of Highland that

24 you identified earlier, do they make investment

25 decisions on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited

Page 28

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 don't recall.

3 Q. Okay. So -- withdrawn. I'll --

4 I'll go on.

5 How did you come to be the director

6 of CLO HoldCo?

7 A. I was asked either by Jim Dondero

8 or -- directly or indirectly by -- by Jim

9 Dondero.

10 Q. And who is Jim Dondero?

11 A. Well, at the time, he was the head

12 or one of the heads of Highland Capital

13 Management, a friend of mine.

14 Q. How long have you known Mr. Dondero?

15 A. Since high school so that -- 1976.

16 Q. Where did you and Mr. Dondero grow

17 up?

18 A. In northern New Jersey.

19 Q. Do you consider him among the

20 closest friends you have?

21 A. I think he is my closest friend.

22 Q. Did you two go to college together?

23 A. We actually -- for the last -- last

24 two years I was at UVA, University of Virginia,

25 excuse me, he and I were -- were at UVA. So we

Page 27

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 without your prior knowledge on occasion?

3 A. On occasion, they do.

4 Q. So there's no rule that your prior

5 approval is needed before investments are made,

6 right?

7 A. I don't know whether they have an

8 internal guideline as to the amount that

9 triggers when they get in touch with me or

10 whether it's a new -- a change, something new,

11 or -- versus recurring. So I don't -- I don't

12 know what they use internally for that metric.

13 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any

14 guideline that was ever used by the Highland

15 employees whereby they were required to obtain

16 your consent prior to effectuating transactions

17 on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited?

18 A. I understand there was one or more,

19 but I do not know that.

20 Q. Okay. Did you ever see such a

21 policy or list of rules that would require your

22 prior consent before the Highland employees

23 effectuated transactions on behalf of CLO

24 HoldCo Limited?

25 A. Possibly some time ago, but I -- I

Page 29

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 did not start out at UVA initially, but -- but

3 we both transferred -- I transferred my

4 sophomore year. I was actually a chemical

5 engineer at the University of Delaware when I

6 transferred in, and then he transferred in his

7 junior year. So we were there at college for

8 two years.

9 Q. And -- and based on your

10 relationship with him, is it your understanding

11 that one of the reasons he chose to transfer to

12 UVA is -- is to -- because you were there?

13 A. Oh, no. He transferred -- he --

14 he -- he transferred there because of the -- so

15 he went to the University of -- he -- he went

16 to Virginia Tech University, which is more

17 known as being an engineering school, which I

18 might have wanted to go to, and less a finance

19 business school. And if I understand things

20 correctly, and I believe I do, he transferred

21 to UVA because of the well-known

22 business/finance program, accounting program.

23 Q. And did you -- did you and

24 Mr. Dondero become roommates at UVA?

25 A. We weren't roommates, but we lived

Page 30

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 in the -- we were housemates. I'm sorry. We

3 were housemates.

4 Q. So you shared a house together. How

5 would you describe your relationship with

6 Mr. Dondero today?

7 A. It's -- it's been strained a while,

8 for some time, but -- but generally, very good.

9 Good to very good.

10 Q. Without -- without getting personal

11 here, can you just generally identify the

12 source of the strain that you described.

13 A. This -- I think it would be fair to

14 say that this bankruptcy, particularly events

15 in 2020 so some months after the bankruptcy was

16 declared, things have become -- we -- we still

17 have a close friendship, but -- but things

18 are -- are a bit -- are a bit more difficult.

19 Q. Were you ever married?

20 A. I've never been married.

21 Q. Did you serve as Mr. Dondero's best

22 man at his wedding?

23 A. I did.

24 Q. Is it fair to say that -- that

25 Mr. Dondero trusts you?

Page 32

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 course of those 45 years, Mr. Dondero has

3 shared confidential information with you that

4 he didn't want you to reveal publicly to other

5 people?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And is it your understanding that

8 because of the nature of your relationship with

9 him, he asked you to serve as the director of

10 CLO HoldCo Limited?

11 A. Yes. I believe it's because he --

12 he trusted -- trusted me with -- with assets

13 relating to his charitable vision. I -- I --

14 yeah. Yes.

15 Q. And is it your understanding that he

16 thought you would help him execute his

17 charitable vision?

18 A. That was the point of attraction

19 initially. It wasn't for money. I wasn't

20 being paid. That was -- the charitable mission

21 was the attraction.

22 Q. Does Mr. Dondero play any role in

23 the management of the CLO HoldCo Limited asset

24 pool?

25 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

Page 31

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

3 BY MR. MORRIS:

4 Q. Withdrawn.

5 Do you believe that Mr. Dondero

6 trusts you?

7 A. I do.

8 Q. Over the years, is it fair to say

9 that Mr. Dondero has confided in you?

10 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

11 BY MR. MORRIS:

12 Q. You can answer if you understand it.

13 A. I think so.

14 Q. I -- I -- what's your answer? You

15 think so?

16 A. Maybe you can de- -- I think of

17 confide as -- could you define confide, please.

18 Q. Sure. Is it -- is it fair to say

19 that over the -- let me -- you've known

20 Mr. Dondero for almost 45 years, right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you consider him to be your

23 closest friend in the world, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And is it fair to say over the

Page 33

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

3 My -- my screen went small and then big again.

4 I was distracted.

5 Q. What role does Mr. Dondero play with

6 respect to the management of the CLO HoldCo

7 Limited asset pool?

8 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

9 A. He is with the company that manages

10 that asset pool. He's one of the people I

11 named previously as managing those assets.

12 Q. He is -- he -- he is the -- do you

13 understand that he has the final

14 decision-making power with respect to the

15 management of the assets that are held by CLO

16 HoldCo Limited?

17 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

18 A. I believe I ansel -- answered that

19 previously. I -- I don't know who has -- for

20 certainty I do not know who has that within

21 that company. I don't. If -- if -- I -- I

22 don't know, consistent with my prior answer.

23 Q. Did you ever ask anybody who had the

24 final decision-making authority for investments

25 on behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. I -- I did not.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you ever make a decision on</p> <p>4 behalf of -- withdrawn.</p> <p>5 In your capacity as a director --</p> <p>6 withdrawn.</p> <p>7 In your capacity as the sole</p> <p>8 director of CLO HoldCo Limited, can you think</p> <p>9 of any decision that you've ever made that</p> <p>10 Mr. Dondero disagreed with?</p> <p>11 A. Since -- prior to the bankruptcy,</p> <p>12 no, not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>13 Q. And since the bankruptcy?</p> <p>14 A. There are decisions that I've made</p> <p>15 that he's disagreed with.</p> <p>16 Q. Can you identify them?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Please do so.</p> <p>19 A. Okay. So the reason I'm pausing is</p> <p>20 I'm trying to put these in chronological order</p> <p>21 and, at the same time, identify maybe some of</p> <p>22 the more important ones versus the lesser</p> <p>23 important ones. One of the decisions I made</p> <p>24 related to a request that I received from the</p> <p>25 independent board of Highland. I don't know</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 how the request was transmitted to me, but I</p> <p>3 believe the way it played out is as follows: I</p> <p>4 believe I was asked to call Jim Seery, and the</p> <p>5 other -- and Russell Nelms, and the third</p> <p>6 independent director, I believe his name is</p> <p>7 John. I -- I forget right now what his last</p> <p>8 name is. They were in New York, said they were</p> <p>9 in a conference room. I called in. They were</p> <p>10 very pleasant. They identified who they were,</p> <p>11 and they had a request, and the request was</p> <p>12 that I agree to a transfer -- or that I -- that</p> <p>13 I agree to allow certain assets that were not</p> <p>14 Highland's assets but they were CLO's as- --</p> <p>15 assets -- apparently, there was no dispute</p> <p>16 about that at any point in time, but that I</p> <p>17 agree to allow certain assets that were due CLO</p> <p>18 to be transferred to the registry of the</p> <p>19 bankruptcy court. And either on that call I</p> <p>20 immediately agreed or ended the call, called my</p> <p>21 attorney, and then immediately agreed. It was</p> <p>22 a very -- I accommodated the request quickly.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And can you just tell me at</p> <p>24 what point in time you spoke with Mr. Dondero,</p> <p>25 and what did he say that you recall?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. I don't know when he became aware of</p> <p>3 that decision. I'm not sure I ever volunteered</p> <p>4 that the decision was even made, but at some</p> <p>5 point, it became an issue because he found out</p> <p>6 through -- if I understand the sequence of</p> <p>7 events correctly, he found out possibly through</p> <p>8 his counsel because there was ultimately</p> <p>9 litigation about that issue. It became known</p> <p>10 to everyone at some point what I had done, I --</p> <p>11 I think. And subsequent to that, it became an</p> <p>12 issue because of CLO HoldCo having fairly</p> <p>13 significant cash flow issues with respect to</p> <p>14 its expenses and obligations, including payment</p> <p>15 of management fees as well as some of the</p> <p>16 scheduled charitable giving that was -- that</p> <p>17 was by contract already predefined. My</p> <p>18 decision to tuck that money -- or to agree</p> <p>19 to -- my agreement to let that money be tucked</p> <p>20 away created some -- created some -- created</p> <p>21 some problems --</p> <p>22 Q. And -- and --</p> <p>23 A. -- for CLO HoldCo.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And I just want you to focus</p> <p>25 specifically on my question, and that is, what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 did Mr. Dondero say to you that -- that causes</p> <p>3 you to testify as you did, that this is one</p> <p>4 issue that he didn't agree with?</p> <p>5 A. I believe his concern was that</p> <p>6 because it was money that was undisputably to</p> <p>7 flow to CLO HoldCo that -- which had many, many</p> <p>8 other nonliquid assets -- this was a form of a</p> <p>9 liquid asset. It was cash in effect, proceeds.</p> <p>10 -- that the money should have been allowed to</p> <p>11 flow to be available for obligations. He</p> <p>12 didn't under- -- I -- I -- I don't know what he</p> <p>13 was thinking, but the -- the issue was that the</p> <p>14 decision to put it into escrow was -- was --</p> <p>15 was in- -- incorrect, that there was no basis</p> <p>16 for it.</p> <p>17 Q. That -- that's an issue where after</p> <p>18 learning of your decision, he didn't agree with</p> <p>19 it; is that fair?</p> <p>20 A. That's right.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Can you think of any decision</p> <p>22 that you've ever made on behalf of CLO HoldCo</p> <p>23 Limited where Mr. Dondero had advance knowledge</p> <p>24 of what you were going to do and he objected to</p> <p>25 it, but you nevertheless overruled his</p>

Page 38

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 objection and went ahead and did what -- did
 3 what you thought was right?
 4 A. Okay. Let me -- let me -- I have --
 5 I'm sorry.
 6 Q. We're here.
 7 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm having some
 8 issues with my screen. So that may have
 9 occurred with respect to the original proof of
 10 claim. Then there was a subsequent amendment
 11 to the proof of claim, and I -- I believe it --
 12 I believe that he might have been aware of both
 13 of those and was in disagreement with -- with
 14 those. But after working with my attorney, we
 15 just -- you know, we did what we thought was
 16 right, and I still think what we did was right.
 17 There was an issue with respect to Har- --
 18 HarbourVest that occurred relatively recently
 19 where he objected to a decision that I had
 20 made. As I understand it, I could have
 21 contacted my attorney and changed the decision,
 22 but I didn't, and I still think that was the
 23 right decision.
 24 We have filed plan objections. I
 25 can't say if he has any -- in that regard, I --

Page 40

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 A. So we had to interface with Highland
 3 employees at some point to get information to
 4 support our proof of claim, and my guess, and
 5 it's just a guess, is that he was aware of
 6 those inquiries. I -- I'm sorry. I shouldn't
 7 speculate. I don't know. But he -- with
 8 respect to the original proof of claim, I'm --
 9 I'm not aware of what specifically he was
 10 objecting to or was -- thought should have been
 11 different, but the -- with respect to the
 12 amended proof of claim, which reduced the
 13 original proof of claim to zero, I think that's
 14 where he had a -- an issue.
 15 Q. And did you speak with him about
 16 that topic prior to the time the amended claim
 17 was filed, or did you only speak with him after
 18 it was filed?
 19 A. I'm not sure the timing of that.
 20 Q. And with respect to HarbourVest, did
 21 he ask you to object to the settlement on
 22 behalf of CLO HoldCo Limited, and is that
 23 something that you declined to do?
 24 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.
 25 A. I'm -- I'm sorry. I was confused

Page 39

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 I -- I don't know what his thoughts are on
 3 objections. They would not have been
 4 communicated with -- by me to him, but my
 5 attorney might have consulted with his
 6 attorney, and there -- they may know what that
 7 difference is, but I -- that was just another
 8 big decision. I -- I -- maybe that --
 9 Q. All right. Let me see if I can --
 10 let me see if I can summarize this. So two
 11 proofs of claim. Is it fair to say that
 12 Mr. Dondero saw those proofs of claim before
 13 they were filed?
 14 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.
 15 BY MR. MORRIS:
 16 Q. Withdrawn.
 17 A. It --
 18 Q. Do -- do you know whether
 19 Mr. Dondero saw the proofs of claim before they
 20 were filed?
 21 A. I don't believe he did.
 22 Q. What -- what steps in filing the
 23 proofs of claim did he object to that you
 24 overruled? Did he think there was -- something
 25 should be different about them?

Page 41

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 with the word. Could you please repeat that?
 3 Q. Yes. You mentioned HarbourVest
 4 before, right?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. And you mentioned that there was an
 7 issue with Mr. Dondero and you concerning
 8 HarbourVest; is that right?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. And did that have to do with whether
 11 or not CLO HoldCo Limited would -- would object
 12 to the debtor's motion to get the HarbourVest
 13 settlement approved?
 14 A. Would -- would get the
 15 HarbourVest --
 16 Q. Settlement approved by the court.
 17 A. I'm not trying to be difficult.
 18 I'm -- I'm -- could you just repeat that one
 19 more time? I'm --
 20 Q. What was -- what was --
 21 A. There was --
 22 Q. Let me try again.
 23 A. Okay.
 24 Q. What was the issue with respect to
 25 HarbourVest that he objected to and -- and you

Page 42

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 overrode his objection and did what you thought
 3 was right anyway?
 4 A. Okay. Okay. That's -- that's
 5 easier for me to understand. I'm sorry. So I
 6 had worked with my attorney or he did the work
 7 and consulted with -- we consulted, but we had
 8 filed an objection, motion objecting to the
 9 settlement, if I understand the terminology and
 10 nomenclature correctly. Okay. He had -- we
 11 had come to an agreement that we had a very
 12 valid argument. That argument was evidenced
 13 by, I guess it was, our motion that was
 14 submitted to the court. On the day of the
 15 hearing to resolve this issue, we pulled our
 16 request, and that was because I believed it did
 17 not have a good-faith basis in law to move
 18 forward on.
 19 Q. And did you discuss that issue with
 20 Mr. Dondero before informing the court that CLO
 21 HoldCo Limited was withdrawing its objection,
 22 or did he learn about that for the first time
 23 during the hearing --
 24 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.
 25 BY MR. MORRIS:

Page 44

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 A. -- thought, okay?
 3 THE REPORTER: I didn't --
 4 A. Okay. So he --
 5 Q. It was a recommendation.
 6 A. Yeah. So he -- he called me with a
 7 recommendation. It was highly urgent. You
 8 know, I was coming out of the men's room, had
 9 my phone with me. I got the call.
 10 MR. CLARK: Hey, Grant, I -- Grant,
 11 I just want to caution you not to -- to --
 12 and I don't think counsel is looking for
 13 this but not to disclose the -- the
 14 substance of any of your communications
 15 with counsel, okay?
 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 17 A. So --
 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'm -- I'm
 19 sorry.
 20 BY MR. MORRIS:
 21 Q. It's -- it's really a very simple
 22 question. Do you recall --
 23 A. He made a recommendation. I -- I --
 24 I think I can answer your question without
 25 going off tangent. I'm sorry. So he -- my

Page 43

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 Q. -- if you know?
 3 A. I -- I understand that he learned it
 4 during the hearing. I don't know the -- I -- I
 5 don't know the -- whether there was any -- I --
 6 I don't know for certain on the second half of
 7 your question.
 8 Q. Let me -- let me try it -- let me
 9 try it this way: Did you speak with
 10 Mr. Dondero about your decision to withdraw the
 11 objection to the HarbourVest settlement prior
 12 to the time your counsel made the announcement
 13 in court?
 14 A. I don't -- I don't believe so. No.
 15 No. No. I'm sorry. No.
 16 Q. And did --
 17 A. Okay. No. Here -- here's where
 18 I'm -- I can clarify, okay? I'm sorry. I can
 19 clarify.
 20 Q. That's all right.
 21 A. I gave the decision to my
 22 attorney -- I -- I agreed with the
 23 recommendation of my attorney, okay? It wasn't
 24 my --
 25 Q. Did you have a good --

Page 45

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021
 2 attorney made a recommendation. I agreed with
 3 it. We with- -- I -- I told him to withdraw --
 4 or I authorized him to withdraw.
 5 Q. Okay.
 6 A. Then I received a communication, and
 7 I -- I guess the most likely scenario is the
 8 motion had been withdrawn by the time Jim
 9 Dondero found out.
 10 Q. And -- and did he write to you, or
 11 did he call you? Did he send you a text?
 12 A. He called me.
 13 Q. What did he say?
 14 A. He was asking why, and I explained,
 15 and I said I agreed with the decision and I was
 16 sticking with the decision.
 17 Q. Let's just -- let's just move on to
 18 a new topic, and let's talk about the structure
 19 of -- of CLO HoldCo. Are you generally
 20 familiar with the ownership structure of CLO
 21 HoldCo?
 22 A. Yeah. I mean, in terms --
 23 Q. Are -- are you -- are you generally
 24 familiar with it? It's not a test. I'm just
 25 asking do you have a general familiarity --

Page 46

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. With CLO HoldCo or the entities

3 associated with CLO HoldCo?

4 Q. The latter.

5 A. Yes, I believe so.

6 Q. All right. I've prepared what's

7 called a demonstrative exhibit. It's just --

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. -- just -- it's a document that, I

10 think, reflects facts, but I want to ask you

11 about it.

12 MR. MORRIS: La Asia, can we please

13 put up Exhibit 1.

14 (SCOTT EXHIBIT 1, Organizational

15 Structure: CLO HoldCo, Ltd., was marked

16 for identification.)

17 BY MR. MORRIS:

18 Q. Okay. Can you see that, Mr. Scott?

19 A. Yes, I can.

20 Q. Okay. So I think I took the

21 information from resolutions that were attached

22 to the CLO HoldCo proof of claim, and that's

23 why you got that little footnote there at the

24 bottom of the page. But let's start in the

25 lower right-hand corner and see if this chart

Page 48

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 particular structure, to the best of your

3 knowledge?

4 A. I -- I didn't -- I'm sorry. I

5 didn't hear you very well.

6 Q. To the best of your knowledge, did

7 Mr. Dondero make the decisions to establish the

8 structure that's reflected on this page?

9 A. Oh, I don't know if he made the

10 decision to establish this structure, although

11 it's -- it's -- I'm sorry. Strike that. I --

12 if -- if what you're saying is did he approve

13 of this structure, to my knowledge, yes.

14 Q. Okay. Do you hold any position with

15 respect to Charitable DAF Fund, L.P.?

16 A. I -- I -- your chart says no. I --

17 I -- I thought I had a role there, too.

18 Q. I don't know. I don't have

19 information on that. That's why I'm asking the

20 question.

21 A. I -- I -- I believe -- yes, I

22 believe I have the same role as I do in -- in

23 CLO HoldCo.

24 Q. And that would be director?

25 A. Yes.

Page 47

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 comports with your understanding of the facts.

3 Do you know that CLO HoldCo Limited

4 was formed in the Cayman Islands?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And to the best of your knowledge,

7 is CLO HoldCo Limited 100 percent owned by the

8 Charitable DAF Fund, L.P.? If you're not sure,

9 just say you're not sure if you don't know.

10 It's not a test.

11 A. So the -- the -- the familiarity

12 I -- I'm -- I'm familiar with the different --

13 I'm confused with the arrangement of the boxes

14 and the ownership interest versus managerial

15 interest. I believe that's -- that's right.

16 Q. Okay. And -- and you're the sole

17 director of CLO HoldCo Limited, right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And this whole structure was -- the

20 idea for this structure, to the best of your

21 knowledge, was to implement Mr. Dondero's plan

22 for charitable giving; is that fair?

23 A. Yes. Ultimately, yes.

24 Q. And is it fair to say then that

25 he -- he made the decision to establish this

Page 49

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Q. And to the best of your knowledge,

3 is the Charitable DAF GP, LLC, the general

4 partner of Charitable DAF Fund, L.P.?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And is it your understanding that

7 you are the managing member of Charitable DAF

8 GP, LLC?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Does Charitable DAF GP, LLC, have

11 any employees?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Does Charitable DAF GP, LLC, have

14 any officers or directors?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Are you the only person affiliated

17 with Charitable DAF GP, LLC, to the best of

18 your --

19 A. I believe so.

20 Q. Do you receive any compensation for

21 serving as the managing member of Charitable

22 DAF GP, LLC?

23 A. No. The -- I don't interact with it

24 very often. It's -- no, I don't receive any

25 compensation.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. Can you tell me in your capacity as</p> <p>3 the managing member of Charitable DAF GP, LLC,</p> <p>4 what's the nature of that entity's business?</p> <p>5 A. It -- it doesn't perform any</p> <p>6 day-to-day operations. My understanding is --</p> <p>7 is that it's -- it's there for purposes of</p> <p>8 compliance. I can't recall the last time I had</p> <p>9 any activity with respect to that.</p> <p>10 Q. How about the Charitable DAF Fund,</p> <p>11 L.P.? I apologize if I've asked you these</p> <p>12 questions.</p> <p>13 A. It -- it's the same. I -- I -- my</p> <p>14 activity is almost exclusively CLO HoldCo.</p> <p>15 Q. All right. Let me just ask the</p> <p>16 questions nevertheless. Does Charitable DAF</p> <p>17 Fund, L.P., have any employees?</p> <p>18 A. Employees? No.</p> <p>19 Q. Does it have any officers and</p> <p>20 directors?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Are you the sole director of</p> <p>23 Charitable DAF Fund, L.P.?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>25 Q. So if we -- if we put under</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Charitable DAF Fund, L.P., Grant Scott,</p> <p>3 director, and we put under CLO HoldCo Limited</p> <p>4 Grant Scott, director, would everything on the</p> <p>5 right side of that page be accurate, to the</p> <p>6 best of your --</p> <p>7 A. I believe so.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, let's move to the left side of</p> <p>9 the page. Have you heard of the entity</p> <p>10 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you the sole director of</p> <p>13 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. How did you become -- how did you</p> <p>16 come to be the char- -- the sole director of</p> <p>17 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>18 A. That was when it was established.</p> <p>19 Q. And did Mr. Dondero ask you to serve</p> <p>20 in that capacity?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And did Mr. Dondero ask you to serve</p> <p>23 as the managing member of Charitable DA- -- DAF</p> <p>24 GP, LLC?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. And did Mr. Dondero ask you to serve</p> <p>3 as the director of Charitable DAF, L.P. --</p> <p>4 withdrawn.</p> <p>5 Did Mr. Dondero ask you to serve as</p> <p>6 director of Charitable DAF Fund, L.P.?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. To the best of your knowledge, does</p> <p>9 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited own 99 percent of</p> <p>10 the limited partnership interests in Charitable</p> <p>11 DAF Fund, L.P.?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. The -- the feed -- the -- the</p> <p>13 feeds -- the -- the three horizontal blocks</p> <p>14 there that identify Highland Dallas Foundation,</p> <p>15 Kansas City, Santa Barbara -- there's a fourth</p> <p>16 of -- relatively de minimus in terms of</p> <p>17 participation. There's a fourth entity that's</p> <p>18 missing. It's Dallas -- I forget the name.</p> <p>19 That -- that -- that structure is -- is a bit</p> <p>20 dated --</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 A. -- as it -- as is shown.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So I will tell you and we can</p> <p>24 look the documents if you want, but attached to</p> <p>25 CLO HoldCo Limited's claim are a number of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 resolutions, and there's one that I have in</p> <p>3 mind that shows Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited</p> <p>4 holding 99 percent of the limited partnership</p> <p>5 interests of Charitable DAF Fund, L.P., and</p> <p>6 there's another that shows it being a hundred</p> <p>7 percent. Do you -- do you know which is</p> <p>8 accurate at least at this time?</p> <p>9 A. There's a 1 percent/99 percent</p> <p>10 division, and I am -- I believe it's the 99</p> <p>11 percent, but I'm -- I'm getting confused by</p> <p>12 the -- by the arrangement. I'm so used to</p> <p>13 another arrangement. I -- I believe the 99</p> <p>14 percent is correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding</p> <p>16 as to who owns the other 1 percent of the</p> <p>17 limited partnership interests of Charitable DAF</p> <p>18 Fund, L.P.?</p> <p>19 A. No. This -- this is confusing to</p> <p>20 me. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. There are, at least on this</p> <p>22 page, three foundations that I think you've</p> <p>23 identified. Are those three foundations</p> <p>24 together with the fourth that you mentioned the</p> <p>25 owners of the Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited?</p>

Page 54

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. Owners?

3 Q. Yes.

4 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

5 A. They -- they only participate in the

6 money that flows up to them.

7 Q. And what does that mean exactly?

8 A. What's that?

9 Q. What does that -- what do you mean

10 by that? Do the foundations fund Charitable

11 DAF Fund HoldCo Limited?

12 A. Initially. Initially, as I

13 understand it, the money flows downward into

14 the Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited before it

15 ultimately makes its way to CLO HoldCo, and

16 then each of those three entities, the various

17 foundations, obtain participation interest in

18 the money that flows back to them.

19 Q. And -- and is that par- -- are those

20 participation interests in Charitable -- you

21 know what, let -- let me just pull up one

22 document and see if that helps.

23 MR. MORRIS: Can we put up -- I

24 think it's Exhibit Number 5.

25 (SCOTT EXHIBIT 2, Unanimous Written

Page 56

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Dallas Foundation?

3 A. Yes, selected by them.

4 Q. Selected by whom?

5 A. By that foundation.

6 Q. Are you -- are you a director of all

7 of the four foundations that feed into the

8 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited entities that --

9 A. No.

10 Q. Which of the four foundations are

11 you a director of?

12 A. This and the Santa Barbara -- I'm

13 sorry, Santa Barbara and Kansas City.

14 Q. So is -- there's one that you're not

15 a director of; is that right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And which one is that?

18 A. The -- could you go back to the --

19 Q. Yeah.

20 MR. MORRIS: Go back to the

21 demonstrative.

22 A. It's the Highland Dallas Foundation

23 and Santa Barbara Foundation.

24 Q. Those are the two that you're a

25 director of?

Page 55

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Consent of Directors In Lieu of Meeting,

3 was marked for identification.)

4 MR. MORRIS: I apologize. Let's go

5 to --

6 MS. CANTY: I'm sorry, John. I

7 can't hear you. Was that not the exhibit?

8 MR. MORRIS: 4.

9 MS. CANTY: Okay.

10 THE REPORTER: And Mr. Morris, you

11 are -- Mr. Morris, you are breaking up just

12 a little bit at the end of your questions.

13 BY MR. MORRIS:

14 Q. Okay. Do you see the document on

15 the screen, sir?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. Okay. And so this is a unanimous

18 written consent of the directors of the

19 Highland Dallas Foundation. That's one of the

20 entities that was on the chart.

21 MR. MORRIS: Can we scroll down to

22 the -- the bottom of the document where the

23 signature lines are. Right there.

24 BY MR. MORRIS:

25 Q. Are you a director of the Highland

Page 57

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. To the best of your knowledge, does

4 Mr. Dondero serve as the president for each of

5 the foundations that we're talking about?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. To the best of your knowledge, is

8 Mr. Dondero a director of each of the

9 foundations that we're talking about?

10 A. Say that again. I'm sorry.

11 Q. Is he also a director of each of the

12 foundations?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Do you know whether any of the

15 foundations has any employees?

16 A. I believe they do, but I -- I -- I

17 can't say for certain.

18 Q. Does -- withdrawn.

19 Do you know if there are any

20 officers of any of the four foundations other

21 than Mr. Dondero's service as president?

22 A. I'm sorry. Say that one more time,

23 please.

24 Q. Yes. Do you know whether any of the

25 four foundations has any officers other than

Page 58

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Mr. Dondero's service as president?

3 A. No.

4 Q. You don't know, or they do not?

5 A. I -- I don't believe anyone else

6 has. I -- actually, I should say I don't -- I

7 don't recall. I -- I don't know. I don't -- I

8 don't know.

9 Q. As a director of the Dallas and

10 Santa Barbara foundations, are you aware of any

11 officers serving for either of those

12 foundations other than Mr. Dondero?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Do you know who the beneficial owner

15 of the Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited entity is?

16 A. The beneficial owner?

17 Q. Correct.

18 A. The various -- various trusts that

19 were used to -- that were the vehicles by which

20 the money originally was established within --

21 within -- within CLO HoldCo.

22 Q. Would that be -- would one of them

23 be the Get Good Nonexempt Trust?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And you're a trustee of the Get Good

Page 60

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 one of the trusts that has an interest in

3 Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Are you a trustee of the Dugaboy

6 Investment Trust?

7 A. I am not.

8 Q. Do you know who is?

9 A. I believe it's his sister.

10 Q. And is that -- you're referring to

11 Mr. Dondero's sister?

12 A. I'm sorry. Yes.

13 Q. And what's the basis for your

14 understanding that Mr. Dondero's sive -- sister

15 serves as the trustee of the Dugaboy Investment

16 Trust?

17 A. Many years ago there was a -- there

18 was a clerical error that identified me as the

19 trustee of the Dugaboy. That error was present

20 for approximately two weeks or a week and a

21 half before it was detected and corrected, and

22 so I know from that correction that it's Nancy

23 Dondero.

24 Q. Are there any other trusts that have

25 an interest in Charitable DAF HoldCo Limited

Page 59

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Nonexempt Trust, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. When did you become a trustee of the

5 Get Good Nonexempt Trust?

6 A. Many years ago. I -- I don't

7 remember.

8 Q. Are there any other trustees of the

9 Get Good Nonexempt Trust?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Does the Get Good Nonexempt Trust

12 have any officers, directors, or employees?

13 A. No.

14 MR. CLARK: Objection, form. Sorry.

15 BY MR. MORRIS:

16 Q. Withdrawn.

17 Do you know whether the Get Good

18 Nonexempt Trust has any officers, directors, or

19 employees?

20 A. It does not.

21 Q. And I apologize if I asked this, but

22 are you the only trustee of the Get Good

23 Nonexempt Trust?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Is the Dugaboy Investment Trust also

Page 61

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 besides those trusts, to the best of your

3 knowledge?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Is it your understanding based on

6 what we've just talked about that the Get Good

7 Nonexempt Trust and the Dugaboy Investment

8 Trust are the indirect beneficiaries of CLO

9 HoldCo Limited?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Can you tell me who the

12 beneficiaries are of the Get Good trust?

13 A. I mean, Jim Dondero.

14 Q. And -- and what is that -- is that

15 based on the trust agreement -- your knowledge

16 of the trust agreement?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Do you have an understanding of who

19 the beneficiary is of the Dugaboy Investment

20 Trust?

21 A. I don't know anything about that

22 trust.

23 MR. MORRIS: Okay. All right.

24 Let's take a short break and reconvene at

25 3:30 Eastern Time. We've been going for a

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 while.</p> <p>3 MR. CLARK: Thank you.</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>5 (Whereupon, there was a recess in</p> <p>6 the proceedings from 3:20 p.m. to</p> <p>7 3:31 p.m.)</p> <p>8 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>9 Q. Mr. Scott, earlier I think you</p> <p>10 testified that you interfaced with the folks at</p> <p>11 Highland in connection with your duties as the</p> <p>12 director of CLO HoldCo Limited, right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Are you aware of any written</p> <p>15 agreement between Highland Capital Management</p> <p>16 and CLO HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, the various servicer</p> <p>18 agreements.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Are you aware that</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero resigned from his position at</p> <p>21 Highland Capital Management sometime in</p> <p>22 October?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Have you communicated with anybody</p> <p>25 at Highland Capital Management about the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 affairs of CLO HoldCo Limited at any time since</p> <p>3 October?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Anybody other than Jim Seery?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Let's start with Mr. Seery.</p> <p>8 You've spoken with him before, right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have his phone number?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. How many times have you spoken with</p> <p>13 Mr. Seery, to the best of your recollection,</p> <p>14 just generally? It's not a test.</p> <p>15 A. Three, maybe four times.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Can you identify by name</p> <p>17 anybody else at Highland that you've spoken</p> <p>18 with since -- in the last two or three months?</p> <p>19 A. I spoke to Jim Dondero. I've spoken</p> <p>20 with Mike Throckmorton. The usual suspects, so</p> <p>21 to speak. Mark Patrick, Mel- -- Melissa</p> <p>22 Schroth.</p> <p>23 Q. Can you recall anybody else?</p> <p>24 A. No. No. Sorry.</p> <p>25 Q. Did you -- did you -- withdrawn.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Do you recall the subject matter of</p> <p>3 your discussions with Mr. Throckmorton?</p> <p>4 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>5 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>6 Q. Withdrawn.</p> <p>7 Do you recall your -- the subject</p> <p>8 matter of your communications with</p> <p>9 Mr. Throckmorton?</p> <p>10 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q. You can answer.</p> <p>13 A. I -- I regularly interface with</p> <p>14 Mr. Throckmorton regarding approvals of</p> <p>15 expenses, and he's my sort of -- he's my point</p> <p>16 person for approving wire transfers and things</p> <p>17 of that nature.</p> <p>18 Q. How about Mr. Patrick, what -- what</p> <p>19 area of responsibility does he have with</p> <p>20 respect to CLO HoldCo Limited?</p> <p>21 A. He -- he doesn't, to my knowledge.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall the nature of the</p> <p>23 substance of any communications that you've had</p> <p>24 with Mr. Patrick since -- you know, the last</p> <p>25 two or three months?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. Yes. Or -- yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And what -- what are the nature of</p> <p>4 those conversations or the substance?</p> <p>5 A. He was -- he was one of the</p> <p>6 individuals that helped to establish the</p> <p>7 hierarchy for the -- what I keep referring to</p> <p>8 as the charitable foundation.</p> <p>9 Q. And -- and do you recall why you</p> <p>10 spoke to him in the last -- or -- withdrawn.</p> <p>11 Do you recall the nature of your</p> <p>12 communications in the last two or three months</p> <p>13 with Mr. Patrick?</p> <p>14 A. I --</p> <p>15 MR. CLARK: And hold on, Grant. I'm</p> <p>16 going to caution -- my understanding -- I</p> <p>17 believe Mr. Patrick's an attorney, and so</p> <p>18 I'm going to caution you that you shouldn't</p> <p>19 disclose the substance of -- of those</p> <p>20 communications based on the attorney-client</p> <p>21 privilege.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Well, I'm -- I -- I am</p> <p>23 the lawyer for the company so -- I guess</p> <p>24 there are other people on the phone and I</p> <p>25 appreciate that, but let's see if we can --</p>

Page 66

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 I don't mean to be contentious here, so it

3 wouldn't -- I -- I'd be part of the

4 privilege anyway.

5 BY MR. MORRIS:

6 Q. But in any event, can you tell me

7 generally -- I'm just looking for general

8 subject matter of your conversations with

9 Mr. Patrick.

10 A. I asked him how I would go about

11 re- -- resigning my position.

12 Q. And when did that conversation take

13 place?

14 A. Within the last two weeks.

15 Q. Have you made a decision to resign?

16 A. No.

17 Q. I think you mentioned Melissa

18 Schroth. Do I have that right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Can you describe generally the

21 communications you had with Ms. Schroth in the

22 last few months.

23 A. They -- she has e-mailed me certain

24 documents that I needed to sign. I had a

25 conversation with her about -- about some

Page 68

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. No.

3 Q. In your discussions with Mr. Seery,

4 did you ever tell him that you thought Highland

5 Capital Management was in default under any

6 agreement in relation to the CLOs?

7 A. No.

8 Q. I want to focus in particular on the

9 shared services agreement. In -- in your

10 discussions with Mr. Seery, did you ever tell

11 him that you believed that Highland Capital

12 Management was in default or in breach of its

13 shared services agreement with CLO HoldCo

14 Limited?

15 A. No.

16 Q. In your communications with

17 Mr. Seery, did you ever indicate any concern on

18 the part of CLO HoldCo Limited with respect to

19 Highland Capital's Man- -- Highland Capital

20 Management's performance under the shared

21 services agreement?

22 A. No.

23 Q. As you sit here today, do you have

24 any reason to believe that Highland Capital

25 Management has done anything wrong in

Page 67

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 home -- home improvements, home construction

3 with respect to Jim Dondero's home in Colorado,

4 and that's -- I -- I think that's -- that's it.

5 Q. Okay. Do you recall communicating

6 with anybody at Highland in the last three

7 months other than Mr. Dondero,

8 Mr. Throckmorton, Mr. Patrick, and Ms. Schroth?

9 A. I -- I spoke with Jim Seery this

10 week.

11 Q. Anybody else?

12 A. I don't -- I don't know.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. I don't think so.

15 Q. In your communications with

16 Mr. Seery, did you two ever discuss his reasons

17 for making any trade on behalf of any CLO?

18 A. No.

19 Q. In your discussions with Mr. Seery,

20 did you ever tell him that you believed that

21 Highland Capital Management had breached any

22 agreement in relation to any CLO?

23 A. Have I had that discussion with Jim

24 Seery?

25 Q. Yes.

Page 69

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 connection with its performance as the

3 portfolio manager of the CLOs in which CLO

4 HoldCo Limited has invested?

5 MR. CLARK: Object to form.

6 A. In terms of the -- are you saying --

7 please say that again. I'm sorry.

8 Q. That's okay. I ask long questions

9 sometimes so forgive me, but I'm trying to

10 get -- I'm trying to be precise so that's why

11 it's difficult sometimes. But let me try

12 again.

13 Does CLO HoldCo Limited contend that

14 Highland Capital Management has done anything

15 wrong in the performance of its duties as

16 portfolio manager of the CLOs in which CLO

17 HoldCo has invested?

18 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

19 A. Yes. It's -- it's outlined in our

20 objections to -- to the plan.

21 Q. Okay. Any -- are you aware of

22 anything that's not contained within CLO Holdco

23 Limited's objection to the plan?

24 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

25 A. I don't know if this is responsive

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 to your quest -- request, but two -- two</p> <p>3 issues, I believe, also pose an in- -- a</p> <p>4 problem for CLO HoldCo. One is we are paying</p> <p>5 for services. I think I referred to the</p> <p>6 services as being soup to nuts, but we are not</p> <p>7 getting the full services. We haven't been for</p> <p>8 some time. So we're likely overpaying. There</p> <p>9 was a Highland Select Equity issue, 11-month</p> <p>10 payment that was delayed which I was unaware of</p> <p>11 was due. Normally, I would have interfaced</p> <p>12 with someone at Highland about that, but my</p> <p>13 attorney -- but my -- my attorney had to make a</p> <p>14 request for payment, and that payment was</p> <p>15 ultimately made. I -- other than that, I -- I</p> <p>16 don't -- I don't know. I don't believe so.</p> <p>17 Q. I want to distinguish between the</p> <p>18 shared services agreement between Highland</p> <p>19 Capital Management and CLO HoldCo Limited on</p> <p>20 the one hand and on the other hand the</p> <p>21 management agreements pursuant to which</p> <p>22 Highland Capital Management manages certain</p> <p>23 CLOs that CLO HoldCo invests in.</p> <p>24 You understand the distinction that</p> <p>25 I'm making?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. Now I do. I'm sorry. I didn't</p> <p>3 appreciate that.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So let's just take each of</p> <p>5 those pieces one at a time. You mentioned your</p> <p>6 concern about services. That's a concern that</p> <p>7 arises under the shared services agreement,</p> <p>8 right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And you mentioned something about a</p> <p>11 delayed payment having to do with Highland</p> <p>12 Select. Do I have that generally right?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And is that a concern that you have</p> <p>15 that arises under the shared services</p> <p>16 agreement?</p> <p>17 A. It's not the agreement with respect</p> <p>18 to the CLOs as I understand it.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So then let's turn to that</p> <p>20 second bucket. You were aware -- you are</p> <p>21 aware, are you not, that Highland Capital</p> <p>22 Management has certain agreements with CLOs</p> <p>23 pursuant to which it manages the assets that</p> <p>24 are owned by the CLOs?</p> <p>25 A. I'm so sorry. Could you please --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. I'll try again.</p> <p>3 A. I'm just -- I'm sorry. I was</p> <p>4 distracted and -- and I -- I'm sorry for asking</p> <p>5 you to repeat it again. Please --</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. Please re- --</p> <p>8 Q. Are you aware that CLO HoldCo</p> <p>9 Limited has made investments in certain CLOs?</p> <p>10 A. Oh, yes, certainly.</p> <p>11 Q. And are you aware that those CLOs</p> <p>12 are managed by Highland Capital Management?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. As the -- as the servicer,</p> <p>14 yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Have you ever seen any of the</p> <p>16 agreements pursuant to which Highland Capital</p> <p>17 Management acts as a servicer?</p> <p>18 A. I've seen a few, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Does CLO HoldCo Limited contend that</p> <p>20 it is a party to any agreement between Highland</p> <p>21 Capital Management and the CLOs?</p> <p>22 MR. CLARK: Object to form. And I</p> <p>23 just want to note for the record that</p> <p>24 Mr. Scott is here testifying in his</p> <p>25 individual capacity, I believe, not as a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 corporate representative.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Fair enough. But he is</p> <p>4 the only representative so...</p> <p>5 MR. CLARK: Fair enough. I just</p> <p>6 want that made -- stated for the record,</p> <p>7 but I also object as to form.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Got it.</p> <p>9 A. It's a third-party beneficiary under</p> <p>10 the agreements.</p> <p>11 Q. And is that because of something you</p> <p>12 read in the document, or is that just your</p> <p>13 belief and understanding?</p> <p>14 A. My belief and understanding.</p> <p>15 Q. And is that belief and understanding</p> <p>16 based on anything other than conversations with</p> <p>17 counsel?</p> <p>18 A. In -- in -- recently it has, but I</p> <p>19 don't recall from previous interactions over</p> <p>20 the years how we discussed that or how I came</p> <p>21 to -- to understand that.</p> <p>22 Q. Does HCLO [sic] HoldCo -- did -- in</p> <p>23 your capacity as the sole director of HCLO</p> <p>24 HoldCo Limited, are you aware of anything that</p> <p>25 Highland Capital Management has done wrong in</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 connection with the services provided under the</p> <p>3 CLO management agreements?</p> <p>4 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>5 A. I -- I don't -- I don't -- I</p> <p>6 don't -- your answer's no.</p> <p>7 Q. In your capacity as the director of</p> <p>8 CLO HoldCo Limited, are you aware of any</p> <p>9 default or breach under the CLO management</p> <p>10 agreements that -- that Highland Capital</p> <p>11 Management has caused?</p> <p>12 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>13 A. We have raised the issue about</p> <p>14 ongoing sales in various -- I'm not sure</p> <p>15 whether they represent a technical breach,</p> <p>16 though.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any</p> <p>18 technical breach?</p> <p>19 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. I'm sorry. You said, no, sir?</p> <p>22 A. My answer's no.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. Do you know who made the</p> <p>24 decision to cause the CLO HoldCo Limited entity</p> <p>25 to invest in the CLOs that are managed by</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Highland Capital?</p> <p>3 A. The select -- ultimately, I had to.</p> <p>4 Q. I thought you testified earlier that</p> <p>5 you didn't make decisions as to investment. Do</p> <p>6 I have that wrong?</p> <p>7 A. The selection.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. I -- I'm --</p> <p>10 Q. So -- so explain to me --</p> <p>11 A. I have to approve -- I have to</p> <p>12 approve the selection. I'm sorry. But the</p> <p>13 people making -- I was putting that in the camp</p> <p>14 of the people that make the selection.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you know if -- do you know</p> <p>16 if there are CLOs in the world that exist that</p> <p>17 aren't managed by Highland Capital Management?</p> <p>18 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>19 A. Are there CLOs in the -- in the</p> <p>20 world that are not --</p> <p>21 Q. Yes.</p> <p>22 A. Yes. It's -- it's a well-known --</p> <p>23 it's a well-known --</p> <p>24 Q. In your capacity as the director of</p> <p>25 CLO HoldCo Limited, did you ever consider</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 making an investment in a CLO that wasn't</p> <p>3 managed by Highland?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Is there any particular reason why</p> <p>6 you haven't given that any consideration?</p> <p>7 A. That hasn't been my role. That's</p> <p>8 not my expertise. That's been something</p> <p>9 Highland has done and, quite frankly, over the</p> <p>10 years brilliantly so, no.</p> <p>11 Q. You're aware that HCM, L.P., has</p> <p>12 filed for bankruptcy, right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. When did you learn that Highland had</p> <p>15 filed for bankruptcy?</p> <p>16 A. After the fact sometime in late --</p> <p>17 late 2019.</p> <p>18 Q. Since the bankruptcy filing, have</p> <p>19 you made any attempt to sell CLO HoldCo</p> <p>20 Limited's position in any of the CLOs that are</p> <p>21 managed by Highland?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. So notwithstanding the bankruptcy</p> <p>24 filing, you as the director haven't made any</p> <p>25 attempt to transfer out of the CLOs that are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 managed by Highland, correct?</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you ever give any thought to</p> <p>5 exiting the CLO vehicles that were managed by</p> <p>6 Highland in light of its bankruptcy filing?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Have you ever discussed with</p> <p>9 Mr. Seery anything having to do with the</p> <p>10 management -- withdrawn.</p> <p>11 Have you ever discussed with</p> <p>12 Mr. Seery any aspect of the debtor's management</p> <p>13 of the CLOs in which CLO HoldCo Limited is</p> <p>14 invested?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. You mentioned earlier a request to</p> <p>17 stop trading. Do I have that right?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And are you aware that a</p> <p>20 letter was written purportedly on behalf of CLO</p> <p>21 HoldCo Limited in which a request to stop</p> <p>22 trading was made?</p> <p>23 A. As a cos- -- yeah. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Have you ever seen that</p> <p>25 letter before?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Can we put up on the</p> <p>4 screen -- I think it's now Exhibit 6. It's</p> <p>5 Exhibit DDDD.</p> <p>6 (SCOTT EXHIBIT 3, Letter to James A.</p> <p>7 Wright, III, et al., from Gregory Demo,</p> <p>8 December 24, 2020, with Exhibit A</p> <p>9 Attachment, was marked for identification.)</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Can we scroll down to,</p> <p>11 I guess, what's Exhibit A. Ri- -- right</p> <p>12 there.</p> <p>13 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>14 Q. You see this is a letter Dece- --</p> <p>15 dated December 22nd?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. In the first paragraph there there's</p> <p>18 a reference to the entities on whose behalf</p> <p>19 this letter is being sent.</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So this letter was sent on</p> <p>23 December 22nd. Did you see a copy of it before</p> <p>24 it was sent?</p> <p>25 A. A -- a draft -- an earlier draft of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 this I did.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Did you provide any comments</p> <p>4 to it?</p> <p>5 A. I did.</p> <p>6 MR. CLARK: Well, hold on. Grant,</p> <p>7 let me caution you. To the extent you</p> <p>8 provided comments to counsel, we're going</p> <p>9 to assert the attorney-client privilege on</p> <p>10 those comments.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: It's just a yes-or-no</p> <p>12 question. I'm not looking for the</p> <p>13 specifics.</p> <p>14 MR. CLARK: Thank you.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Are you aware that earlier letters</p> <p>17 were -- withdrawn.</p> <p>18 Are you aware that prior to December</p> <p>19 22nd, the entities other than CLO HoldCo</p> <p>20 Limited that are listed in this pers- -- first</p> <p>21 paragraph had sent a letter making the same</p> <p>22 request?</p> <p>23 A. With respect to a letter, no. No,</p> <p>24 I -- I did not.</p> <p>25 Q. Are you aware as you sit here now</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 that the entities other than CLO HoldCo Limited</p> <p>3 that are listed in the first paragraph made a</p> <p>4 motion in the court asking the court for an</p> <p>5 order that would have prevented Highland from</p> <p>6 making any transactions for a limited period of</p> <p>7 time?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you know that motion was being</p> <p>10 made prior to the time that it was made?</p> <p>11 A. I'm not sure.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you ever think about whether CLO</p> <p>13 HoldCo Limited should join that particular</p> <p>14 motion?</p> <p>15 A. I believe we were -- my attorney was</p> <p>16 aware of it. I don't recall our discussion</p> <p>17 about it. We were aware -- when I say we, I</p> <p>18 mean collectively -- and did not join it.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Can you tell me why you did</p> <p>20 not join it.</p> <p>21 MR. CLARK: And, again, Grant, to --</p> <p>22 to the extent it's based on communications</p> <p>23 with counsel, you're free to say that</p> <p>24 but -- but not to disclose any substance of</p> <p>25 communications with counsel.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. The subject of this letter on the</p> <p>3 22nd which yielded the original letter you</p> <p>4 briefly showed me on the 24th as well as an</p> <p>5 additional letter on the 28th identified two</p> <p>6 points as I understand it. The first point is</p> <p>7 what I believe is the somewhat innocuous</p> <p>8 request to halt sales, not a demand in any way.</p> <p>9 And the second more substantive issue has to do</p> <p>10 with steps to remove Highland or a subsequent</p> <p>11 derived entity from Highland from the various</p> <p>12 services agreements that you had previously --</p> <p>13 we had previously discussed. Neither of those</p> <p>14 issues met the require- -- neither of those</p> <p>15 issues led us to believe that a motion such as</p> <p>16 what you've just mentioned was -- was right --</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. -- because no -- no decision has</p> <p>19 been made on that.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: So I want to go back to</p> <p>22 my question and move to strike as</p> <p>23 nonresponsive, and I'll just ask my</p> <p>24 question again.</p> <p>25 BY MR. MORRIS:</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. Why did CLO HoldCo Limited decide</p> <p>3 not to participate in the earlier motion that</p> <p>4 was brought by the other entities that are</p> <p>5 identified in Paragraph 1 that asked the court</p> <p>6 to stop Highland from engaging in trades?</p> <p>7 A. John, I'm so sorry. There was a</p> <p>8 feedback loop that came up when you started to</p> <p>9 re- -- re- -- recite -- restate your question.</p> <p>10 I'm sorry.</p> <p>11 Q. That's okay. Why did CLO HoldCo</p> <p>12 Limited decide not to join in the earlier</p> <p>13 motion where the entities listed in Paragraph 1</p> <p>14 asked the court to order Highland not to make</p> <p>15 any further trades? Why did they not join that</p> <p>16 motion?</p> <p>17 A. The -- the issue didn't rise to</p> <p>18 the -- I don't believe we had formulated a</p> <p>19 legal basis sufficient to justify such steps.</p> <p>20 We hadn't laid the foundation necessary to --</p> <p>21 to do that.</p> <p>22 Q. Are you aware of what the court</p> <p>23 decided?</p> <p>24 A. By virtue of the original letter you</p> <p>25 sent me dated the -- or show -- showed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 initially dated the 24th, I have a general</p> <p>3 understanding of what they decided.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you -- did you ever review the</p> <p>5 transcript of the hearing where the other</p> <p>6 parties asked the court to stop Highland from</p> <p>7 engaging in any further trades on the CLOs?</p> <p>8 A. I did not.</p> <p>9 Q. Is there anything different about</p> <p>10 the request in this letter, to the best of your</p> <p>11 knowledge, from the request that was made of</p> <p>12 the court just six days earlier?</p> <p>13 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>14 A. Yes. There's a -- in -- in my -- my</p> <p>15 view there's a substantial difference between</p> <p>16 filing an action converting a request into</p> <p>17 essentially a demand versus a gentle request</p> <p>18 with multiple caveats, that that request is not</p> <p>19 a demand.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Let me ask you this: Are you</p> <p>21 aware -- what -- when did you first learn that</p> <p>22 Highland was making trades in its capacity as</p> <p>23 the servicer of the CLOs? When -- when did you</p> <p>24 first learn that Highland was doing that? Ten</p> <p>25 years ago, right? I mean --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. Oh. Oh. Oh, I'm -- yeah. Yeah.</p> <p>3 Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Of course.</p> <p>4 Q. Right? I mean, Highland has been</p> <p>5 making trades on behalf of CLOs for years,</p> <p>6 right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And Highland was making trades on</p> <p>9 behalf of CLOs throughout 2020, to the best of</p> <p>10 your knowledge, right?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And you know when Jim Dondero was</p> <p>13 still with Highland, he was making trades on</p> <p>14 behalf of CLO -- on behalf of the CLOs, right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And you never objected when Jim</p> <p>17 Dondero was doing it; is that right?</p> <p>18 A. That is correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So what changed that caused</p> <p>20 you in your capacity as the director of CLO</p> <p>21 HoldCo to request a full stoppage of trading?</p> <p>22 A. It was my understanding that because</p> <p>23 of the bankruptcy and the removal of Jim</p> <p>24 Dondero that the replacement decision-makers</p> <p>25 did not have the expertise where I felt</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 comfortable with them making those decisions,</p> <p>3 but...</p> <p>4 Q. I thought you testified earlier that</p> <p>5 you weren't aware that Mr. Dondero left</p> <p>6 Highland. Am I mistaken in my recollection?</p> <p>7 A. I think you said in October, and</p> <p>8 I -- as I -- there's some con- -- I have</p> <p>9 confusion about when he left versus when he was</p> <p>10 still there but other -- but he was not making</p> <p>11 those trades.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Fair enough. The bankruptcy</p> <p>13 has nothing to do with your desire to stop</p> <p>14 trading, right, because Highland traded for a</p> <p>15 year after the bankruptcy and never took any</p> <p>16 action to try to stop Highland from trading on</p> <p>17 behalf of the CLOs, fair?</p> <p>18 A. The -- Highland as of right now</p> <p>19 isn't the same entity it was -- well, the</p> <p>20 decision-making team -- the -- the financial</p> <p>21 decision-making team for CLO Holdco's is no</p> <p>22 longer the team I have worked with, and upon</p> <p>23 discussion with counsel, we agreed -- I agreed</p> <p>24 to this letter, which I did, to just maintain</p> <p>25 the status quo.</p>

Page 86

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Q. How did you form your opinion that

3 the debtor doesn't have the expertise to

4 execute trades on behalf of the CLOs today?

5 What's the basis for that belief?

6 A. I -- as I understood it, the -- the

7 people historically making that decision were

8 no longer making that decision.

9 Q. Who besides Mr. Dondero --

10 withdrawn.

11 Who are you referring to?

12 A. Well, Mr. Dondero is one. I don't

13 know the names, but I -- I understood it to

14 mean that the group previously responsible, for

15 exam- -- for example, Hunter Covitz, including

16 Hun- -- him, were no longer involved in the

17 decision-making process, but...

18 Q. How did you -- how -- how -- who

19 gave you the information that led you to

20 conclude that Hunter Covitz was no longer

21 involved in the decision-making process?

22 A. Specifically him and that name being

23 mentioned, I -- I -- I wasn't informed of his

24 speci- -- him -- him being removed. I was

25 under the impression that the team that had

Page 88

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 updated my contacts to -- to add his name so

3 now I have his name. And during that

4 conversation he informed me that he did have

5 that expertise --

6 Q. And --

7 A. -- without me making any inquiry.

8 He volunteered that.

9 Q. But you hadn't made any inquiry

10 prior to the time that you authorized the

11 sending of this letter; is that fair?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. Do you know whether Mr. Seery, in

14 fact, engaged in transactions on behalf of the

15 debtor since he was appointed back in January?

16 A. I do not.

17 Q. Did you ask that question prior to

18 the time you authorized the sending of this

19 letter?

20 A. I did not.

21 Q. Can you identify a single

22 transaction that Jim Seery has ever made that

23 you disagree with?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Can you identify any transaction

Page 87

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 previously been doing that was no longer doing

3 it.

4 Q. And what gave you that impression?

5 A. Was communications I had with my

6 attorney.

7 Q. Okay. Is there any source for your

8 information that led you to conclude that the

9 team was no longer there that was able to

10 engage in the trades on behalf of the CLOs

11 other than your attorneys?

12 A. Well, this -- this letter -- I -- I

13 think the answer is no.

14 Q. Thank you. Do you know if Jim -- do

15 you have an opinion or a view as to whether Jim

16 Seery is qualified to make trades?

17 A. This --

18 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

19 A. I don't know -- I spoke to Jim Seery

20 earlier this week. You -- you asked me whether

21 I had his number. I said I did. That's only

22 because he called me. My phone rang with his

23 number. It was a number I did not recognize,

24 it was not in my contacts, but he left me a

25 voice mail so I called him back. Then I

Page 89

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 that the debtor made on behalf of any of the

3 CLOs since the time that you understand

4 Mr. Dondero left Highland that you disagree

5 with?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Did you have any discussion with any

8 representative of any of the entities listed on

9 this document where they told you they believe

10 Jim Seery didn't have the expertise to engage

11 in transactions on behalf of the whole -- of

12 the CLOs?

13 A. You -- your question -- I'm -- I'm

14 sorry. I'm trying to be -- I'm trying to be a

15 hundred perc- -- I'm trying to be accurate

16 here.

17 Q. Let me interrupt you and just say,

18 I'm very grateful for your testimony. I know

19 this is not easy, and I do believe that you're

20 earnestly and honestly trying to answer the

21 questions the best you can. So no apologies

22 necessary anymore. If you need me to repeat

23 the question or rephrase it, just say that,

24 okay?

25 A. Please -- yes.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. Please -- please repeat that.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you ever communicate with any</p> <p>5 employee, officer, director, representative of</p> <p>6 any of the entities that are on this page</p> <p>7 concerning the debtor's ability to service the</p> <p>8 CLOs?</p> <p>9 A. I believe so.</p> <p>10 Q. And can you identify the person or</p> <p>11 persons?</p> <p>12 A. I think it's Jim Dondero.</p> <p>13 Q. Anybody else other than Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. When did you have that conversation</p> <p>16 or those conversations with Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>17 A. This letter is dated the 22nd --</p> <p>18 Q. Correct.</p> <p>19 A. -- right?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes.</p> <p>21 A. I believe that's the Tuesday before</p> <p>22 Christmas, and this would have been on the</p> <p>23 21st, the Monday.</p> <p>24 Q. What do you recall about your</p> <p>25 conversation on the 21st regarding the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 substance of this particular letter?</p> <p>3 A. Jim Dondero described why he</p> <p>4 believed sales being made on an ongoing basis</p> <p>5 after a request was made to stop was im- --</p> <p>6 improper.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you -- do you rely on what</p> <p>8 Mr. Dondero said to you during that phone call</p> <p>9 on December 21st in -- in deciding to join in</p> <p>10 this particular letter?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you only then rely on the</p> <p>13 information you obtained from counsel?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. I -- I -- I -- I considered</p> <p>15 this letter to be nearly the most gentle</p> <p>16 request imaginable amongst lawyers to maintain</p> <p>17 the status quo.</p> <p>18 Q. And the request that's made in this</p> <p>19 letter is perfectly consistent with what</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero told you on the 21st of December,</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A. I don't -- no.</p> <p>23 Q. How --</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Can we go to the end of</p> <p>25 this letter, please. All right. Right</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 there.</p> <p>3 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>4 Q. Do you see the request that's in the</p> <p>5 last sentence?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Is that the same thing that</p> <p>8 Mr. Dondero told you should happen, that --</p> <p>9 that there should be no further CLO</p> <p>10 transactions at least until the issues raised</p> <p>11 and addressed by the debtor's plan were</p> <p>12 resolved substantively?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Is there anything that he said</p> <p>15 that's inconsistent with the request that's</p> <p>16 made here?</p> <p>17 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.</p> <p>18 A. This -- and can you -- can you show</p> <p>19 me earlier parts?</p> <p>20 Q. Of course. You know what, I'll</p> <p>21 withdraw the question.</p> <p>22 And let me see if I can do it this</p> <p>23 way: In your discussion with Mr. Dondero, did</p> <p>24 he indicate that he had seen a draft of this</p> <p>25 letter?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021</p> <p>2 A. No. And I didn't -- I didn't have a</p> <p>3 discussion with him. I -- I merely listened to</p> <p>4 him. There was no -- I -- I had no input to</p> <p>5 the conversation.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. I -- I did -- I didn't --</p> <p>7 I -- I appreciate that. So he called you; is</p> <p>8 that right?</p> <p>9 A. We -- we called in.</p> <p>10 Q. Oh, was it --</p> <p>11 A. I --</p> <p>12 Q. Was it --</p> <p>13 A. I don't know --</p> <p>14 Q. Was it --</p> <p>15 A. I don't know the sequence of the</p> <p>16 calls. I'm sorry.</p> <p>17 Q. Was there anybody on the call other</p> <p>18 than you and Mr. Dondero, the call that you're</p> <p>19 describing on December 21st?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, my attorney and an attorney --</p> <p>21 I believe the attorney that signed this letter.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And I just want to focus on</p> <p>23 what Mr. Dondero said. Did he -- did he say</p> <p>24 during the call that Highland should not be</p> <p>25 engaging in any further CLO transactions?</p>

Page 94

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. He took a more -- if I can

3 characterize his mental -- I looked at the

4 issue of maintaining the status quo since there

5 was somebody that was complaining about it,

6 that that -- because it -- it isn't assets of

7 Highland, it doesn't adversely affect Highland.

8 If -- if stopping the sales -- you know, my --

9 my thought was -- is if stopping the sales

10 reduces the likelihood of litigation

11 disputes -- you already saw that there was the

12 one from middle of December. I -- I thought

13 that would be the more appropriate way to go.

14 I didn't think there'd be any harm.

15 Q. And was that your --

16 A. I think -- I think Jim Dondero had a

17 more legalistic view of its impro- -- im- --

18 improper nature.

19 Q. And did he share that view with you?

20 A. On Monday, yes.

21 Q. Can you describe for me your

22 recollection of what he said about the

23 legalistic view?

24 A. Just the mention of -- all I recall

25 is in terms of -- the law associated with it

Page 96

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 transactions before they made a request six

3 days after the court threw out their suit as

4 frivolous? I'll withdraw that. That's too

5 much.

6 A few days later did you authorize

7 the sending of another letter to the debtor in

8 which you suggested that the -- the entities on

9 behoove -- on -- on whose behalf the letter was

10 sent might take steps to terminate the CLO

11 management agreements?

12 A. I did not see -- so there is a --

13 there is a December 28th letter.

14 MR. MORRIS: Let's just go to the

15 next letter, and -- and let's just call

16 that up.

17 BY MR. MORRIS:

18 Q. I think it's -- I think it's

19 actually dated December 23rd. It was the next

20 day.

21 A. Yes.

22 (SCOTT EXHIBIT 4, Letter to James A.

23 Wright, III, et al., from Gregory Demo,

24 December 24, 2020, with Exhibit A

25 Attachment, was marked for identification.)

Page 95

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 was -- the Advisers Act was mentioned --

3 Q. Did you have --

4 A. -- but I don't -- I don't know what

5 that is. You know, I don't know what that is.

6 Q. And you -- and -- and you never --

7 it never occurred to you to pick up the phone

8 and -- and to speak with Mr. Seery to see why

9 it was he thought he should be engaging in

10 transactions?

11 A. No. And -- but I -- my lack of

12 volunteering a phone call to Jim Seery isn't --

13 it's -- it's because of -- I -- I thought any

14 phone call by me to Jim Seery would be

15 inappropriate because he's represented by

16 counsel. I mean, we were working on claims

17 against him --

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. -- right, so...

20 Q. Did you -- did you -- did you think

21 to instruct your lawyers to reach out to

22 Mr. Seery to actually speak to him instead of

23 just sending a letter like this and to -- and

24 to ask -- and to maybe inquire as to why he

25 thought it was appropriate to engage in

Page 97

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 BY MR. MORRIS:

3 Q. And do you recall that the next day

4 CLO HoldCo Limited joined in another letter to

5 the debtors? Do you have that recollection?

6 A. Yes. Not -- not be- -- yes, I do,

7 but -- yes, I do.

8 Q. Did you see this letter before it

9 was sent?

10 A. I don't believe so.

11 Q. Did you authorize the sending of

12 this letter?

13 A. I gave -- I relied on my attorney to

14 guide me through this process.

15 Q. I appreciate that.

16 A. I let him make that call on this

17 letter, which is -- copies most of the prior

18 letter and then adds another issue.

19 Q. Okay. Do you have an understanding

20 of what that issue is?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And what is your understanding of

23 what that additional issue is?

24 A. Somewhere in this letter of the 23rd

25 there's an -- there's an -- an inclusion of

Page 98

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 a -- a statement of an -- a future intent.

3 Q. A future intent to do what?

4 A. To remove Highland as the servicer

5 of the agreements you talked to me about

6 previously.

7 Q. Can you tell me whether there's a

8 factual basis on which CLO HoldCo Limited

9 believes that the debtor should be removed as

10 the servicer of the portfolio manager of the

11 CLOs?

12 A. Yes. There are -- there are

13 multiple bases to consider subject to all the

14 other conditional language in the request of

15 these letters to consider that going forward

16 but no decision. That intent is an intent to

17 evaluate, not an intent to take any action. I

18 haven't authorized any action. I don't feel

19 comfortable with my knowledge base at this

20 time, but it's something being explored.

21 Q. So knowing everything that you know

22 as of today, you have not yet formed a decision

23 as to whether CLO HoldCo Limited will take any

24 steps to terminate Highland's portfolio

25 management agreements, correct?

Page 100

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 know why I'm a patent attorney and not one of

3 you guys. But the thing that resonates with me

4 the most from a legal substantive, black letter

5 law sort of issue is the plan for

6 reorganization, which we've objected to. I've

7 re- -- I've reviewed the objection, and that

8 sets forth our -- that sets forth my position,

9 and I consider that to be quite material. The

10 others are issues of practical effects of

11 what's happened thus far with the bankruptcy,

12 the termination of the experts with a long

13 track record of success, the soon-to-be

14 termination of all employees, the cancellation

15 of various representation agreements, things of

16 that nature looked at from an additive sort of

17 perspective.

18 Q. You know that -- can we refer to the

19 counterparties under the CLO management

20 agreements as the issuers? Are you familiar

21 with that term?

22 A. I -- I am familiar with the term

23 issuers, yes.

24 Q. Okay. And do you understand --

25 A. There's an agreement between the --

Page 99

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. I don't -- I don't want to be

3 difficult, but I'm -- I'm confused yet again

4 with your question. But I have not -- there --

5 there are a number of cr- -- a number of issues

6 that with my nonfinance background would

7 suggest to me that they -- they may be bases

8 for -- for cause, to -- to assert a cause. And

9 I've been conferring with my attorney about

10 that, but it's very preliminary and no -- no

11 decision has been made. I -- no decision is

12 being made.

13 Q. So what -- what are the factors that

14 are causing you to consider possibly seeking to

15 begin the process of terminating the CLO

16 management agreements?

17 A. Well, I guess I would break them

18 down into maybe two categories, maybe more.

19 The one that resonates most with me -- I don't

20 know -- maybe because even though I'm a patent

21 attorney, I guess at one point I was an

22 attorney. But the thing that resonates most

23 with me --

24 Q. You are an attorney.

25 A. -- at the moment -- well, now you

Page 101

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 I'm sorry.

3 Q. There's an agreement between the

4 issuers and Highland pursuant to which Highland

5 manages the CLO assets, right?

6 A. With res- -- yes.

7 Q. Okay. And do you understand what's

8 going to happen to those management contracts

9 in connection with the plan of reorganization?

10 A. Partially.

11 Q. What's your partial understanding?

12 A. Well, I -- I wouldn't want to

13 characterize it as a partial understanding. I

14 mean, with respect to part of the agreement.

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. Okay. Our plan objection lays out

17 our basis for objecting to steps that Highland

18 is actively taking to preclude us from the full

19 rights that we have as third-party

20 beneficiaries under that agreement, and they're

21 not de minimus. They're quite material. They

22 relate to cause issues and no-cause issues, for

23 example, as out- -- as outlined in our --

24 our -- our objections.

25 Q. Okay. Did you ever make any attempt

Page 102

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 to speak with any issuer concerning Highland's

3 performance under the CLO management

4 agreements?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Why not?

7 A. I -- I don't have any facts --

8 understand I -- I get all of the reports

9 periodically from Highland -- from Highland.

10 I -- I don't have a basis that I'm aware of to

11 complain about performance issues. This is a

12 legal issue that I'm talking about.

13 Q. So you have no basis to suggest that

14 Highland hasn't performed under the CLO

15 management agreements, correct?

16 A. Well, Highland as of right now,

17 the -- the issue really is as -- as to what's

18 next, not -- not -- I -- I don't -- I don't

19 believe I have facts that support a com- --

20 a -- an issue right now. It's -- it's --

21 it's -- it's going forward that is the problem.

22 Q. I --

23 A. That's -- you know, that's --

24 Q. Have you given any thought to

25 speaking with the issuers to try to get their

Page 104

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 negotiating with Highland to permit Highland to

3 assume the CLO management agreements and to

4 continue operating under them?

5 A. I believe so --

6 Q. Is that --

7 A. -- but they're --

8 Q. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

9 A. As I understand it, Highland

10 wants -- Highland or its subsidiary -- or

11 its -- its -- its postbankruptcy relative --

12 post- -- excuse me, that Highland

13 postbankruptcy -- or postplan confirmation

14 wants to move forward, substitute itself for

15 the prior issuer -- no, sorry, substitute

16 itself for the prior servicer under those

17 agreements to assume those agreements but in

18 the process of assuming those agreements,

19 carving out a bunch of provisions that from a

20 legal standpoint and a potentially future

21 practical and monetary standpoint are quite

22 substantial, and that has to relate to the

23 removal rights based on cause and without

24 cause. As I understand it, that's all set

25 forth in our plan objection.

Page 103

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 views as to what they think is going to happen

3 in the future?

4 A. No.

5 Q. They're the -- they're the actual

6 direct beneficiaries under the CLO management

7 agreements, to the best of your understanding,

8 right?

9 A. Yes. Their rights may not be

10 impacted; it's CLO Holdco's rights that are

11 going to be adversely impacted. So it's -- I

12 don't know that our view is in alignment with

13 their view. But to answer your question, no,

14 we did not contact them.

15 Q. Do you have any knowledge or

16 information as to any assertion by the issuers

17 that Highland is in breach of any of the CLO

18 management agreements?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Do you have any knowledge or

21 information as to whether or not any of the

22 issuers believe that Highland is in default

23 under the CLO management agreements?

24 A. No, I don't have any of those facts.

25 Q. Are you aware that the issuers are

Page 105

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 Q. Okay. Are you aware of a third

3 letter that was sent to Highland on behalf of

4 CLO HoldCo and the other entities that are

5 listed in this document?

6 A. The December 28th letter, is that

7 what you mean?

8 Q. It's actually December 31st, if I

9 can refresh your recollection.

10 MR. MORRIS: Can we put up Exhibit

11 F?

12 (SCOTT EXHIBIT 5, Letter to Jeffrey

13 N. Pomerantz from R. Charles Miller,

14 December 31, 2020, was marked for

15 identification.)

16 BY MR. MORRIS:

17 Q. You remember that there was a letter

18 dated on or about December 31st that was

19 sent -- oh, actually, you know, I apologize.

20 If we scroll down to the -- to the next -- to

21 the first box, there actually is no mention of

22 CLO HoldCo.

23 Are you aware that Mr. Dondero was

24 evicted from Highland's offices as of the end

25 of the year?

Page 106

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 A. I -- I didn't know the time, but I

3 understand he's no longer there.

4 Q. Does CLO HoldCo Limited contend that

5 it was damaged in any way by Mr. Dondero's

6 eviction from the Highland suite of offices?

7 MR. CLARK: Objection, form.

8 A. I -- I don't have any information to

9 support that as of this time.

10 Q. It's not -- it's not a belief that

11 you hold today?

12 A. I don't have a belief of that, yes.

13 MR. MORRIS: All right. Let's take

14 a short break. I may be done. I -- I'm

15 grateful, Mr. Scott, and don't want to

16 abuse your time. Give me -- let -- just

17 let -- let's come back at 4:50, just eight

18 minutes, and if I have anything further, it

19 will be brief.

20 (Whereupon, there was a recess in

21 the proceedings from 4:42 p.m. to

22 4:49 p.m.)

23 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Mr. Scott, thank

24 you very much for your time. I have no

25 further questions.

Page 108

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 C E R T I F I C A T E

3 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)

4) ss.:

5 COUNTY OF WAKE)

6

7 I, LISA A. WHEELER, RPR, CRR, a

8 Notary Public within and for the State of New

9 York, do hereby certify:

10 That GRANT SCOTT, the witness whose

11 deposition is hereinbefore set forth, having

12 produced satisfactory evidence of

13 identification and having been first duly sworn

14 by me, according to the emergency video

15 notarization requirements contained in G.S.

16 10B-25, and that such deposition is a true

17 record of the testimony given by such witness.

18 I further certify that I am not

19 related to any of the parties to this action by

20 blood or marriage; and that I am in no way

21 interested in the outcome of this matter.

22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto

23 set my hand this 21st day of January, 2021.

24 *Lisa Wheeler*

25 LISA A. WHEELER, RPR, CRR

Page 107

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

3 MR. CLARK: We will reserve our

4 questions.

5 THE WITNESS: I appreciate it, John.

6 MR. MORRIS: Take care. Thanks for

7 your time and your -- and your diligence.

8 I do appreciate it. Take care, guys.

9 THE REPORTER: Okay.

10 MR. CLARK: Thank you.

11 MR. HOGEWOOD: No questions from us.

12 (Time Noted: 4:50 p.m.)

13

14

15 -----

16 GRANT SCOTT

17

18 Subscribed and sworn to before me

19 this day of 2021.

20

21 -----

22

23

24

25

Page 109

1 GRANT SCOTT - 1/21/2021

2 -----I N D E X-----

3 PAGE

4 EXAMINATION BY MR. MORRIS 7

5

6 -----EXHIBITS-----

7

8 PAGE

9 EXHIBIT 1 Organizational Structure: 46

10 EXHIBIT 2 Unanimous Written Consent of 54

11 Directors In Lieu of Meeting

12 EXHIBIT 3 Letter to James A. Wright, 78

13 III, et al., from Gregory

14 EXHIBIT 4 Letter to James A. Wright, 96

15 III, et al. From Gregory

16 Demo, December 24, 2020, with

17 EXHIBIT 5 Letter to Jeffrey N. 105

18 Pomerantz from R. Charles

19 Miller, December 31, 2020

20

21

22

23

24

25

<p>1</p> <p>1 46:13,14 53:9,16 82:5,13</p> <p>1/21/2021 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1</p> <p>100 47:7</p> <p>11-month 70:9</p> <p>1976 28:15</p> <p>1984 24:20</p> <p>1986 24:22</p> <p>1988 25:5</p> <p>1991 25:6</p> <p>2</p> <p>2 54:25</p> <p>2012 16:23</p> <p>2019 23:4 76:17</p> <p>2020 30:15 78:8 84:9 96:24 105:14</p> <p>2021 107:19</p>	<p>21st 90:23,25 91:9,20 93:19</p> <p>22nd 78:15,23 79:19 81:3 90:17</p> <p>23rd 96:19 97:24</p> <p>24 78:8 96:24</p> <p>24th 81:4 83:2</p> <p>28th 81:5 96:13 105:6</p> <p>3</p> <p>3 78:6</p> <p>31 105:14</p> <p>31st 105:8,18</p> <p>3:20 62:6</p> <p>3:30 61:25</p> <p>3:31 62:7</p> <p>4</p> <p>4 55:8 96:22</p> <p>45 31:20 32:2</p> <p>4:42 106:21</p> <p>4:49 106:22</p> <p>4:50 106:17 107:12</p> <p>5</p> <p>5 54:24 105:12</p> <p>6</p> <p>6 78:4</p> <p>9</p> <p>99 52:9 53:4,10,13</p> <p>A</p> <p>ability 90:7</p> <p>Absolutely 8:22</p> <p>abuse 106:16</p>	<p>accommodated 35:22</p> <p>accounting 29:22</p> <p>accurate 51:5 53:8 89:15</p> <p>acronym 12:23</p> <p>act 11:13 95:2</p> <p>acting 10:10</p> <p>action 83:16 85:16 98:17,18</p> <p>actively 101:18</p> <p>activity 50:9,14</p> <p>acts 72:17</p> <p>actual 6:24 103:5</p> <p>add 88:2</p> <p>additional 81:5 97:23</p> <p>additive 100:16</p> <p>addressed 92:11</p> <p>addressing 20:4</p> <p>adds 97:18</p> <p>admissibility 6:23</p> <p>advance 37:23</p> <p>adversely 94:7 103:11</p> <p>Advisers 95:2</p> <p>affairs 63:2</p> <p>affect 94:7</p> <p>affiliated 49:16</p> <p>aft- 23:5</p> <p>afternoon 6:6 7:7</p> <p>agree 35:12,13,17 36:18 37:4,18</p> <p>agreed 35:20,21 43:22 45:2,15 85:23</p> <p>agreement 26:7 36:19 42:11 61:15,16 62:15 67:22 68:6,9, 13,21 70:18 71:7,16, 17 72:20 100:25 101:3,14,20</p>	<p>agreements 24:4 62:18 70:21 71:22 72:16 73:10 74:3,10 81:12 96:11 98:5,25 99:16 100:15,20 102:4,15 103:7,18,23 104:3,17,18</p> <p>agrees 6:16</p> <p>ahead 38:2 104:8</p> <p>alignment 103:12</p> <p>allowed 37:10</p> <p>amended 40:12,16</p> <p>amendment 38:10</p> <p>amount 27:8</p> <p>amounts 24:6</p> <p>announcement 43:12</p> <p>ansel 33:18</p> <p>answer's 74:6,22</p> <p>anymore 89:22</p> <p>apologies 89:21</p> <p>apologize 50:11 55:4 59:21 105:19</p> <p>apparently 35:15</p> <p>appointed 88:15</p> <p>appointment 17:6</p> <p>approval 27:5</p> <p>approvals 64:14</p> <p>approve 48:12 75:11,12</p> <p>approved 41:13,16</p> <p>approving 64:16</p> <p>approximately 11:17 17:6 60:20</p> <p>area 25:24 64:19</p> <p>argument 42:12</p> <p>arises 71:7,15</p> <p>arrangement 18:10 47:13 53:12,13</p> <p>as- 35:14</p>	<p>Asia 46:12</p> <p>aspect 19:24 20:6 77:12</p> <p>assert 79:9 99:8</p> <p>assertion 103:16</p> <p>asset 32:23 33:7,10 37:9</p> <p>assets 10:22,24 11:14 12:11 13:13, 15,17,20,23 18:25 19:15 20:11 24:5 32:12 33:11,15 35:13,14,15,17 37:8 71:23 94:6 101:5</p> <p>assume 104:3,17</p> <p>assumed 11:25</p> <p>assuming 104:18</p> <p>attached 46:21 52:24</p> <p>Attachment 78:9 96:25</p> <p>attempt 76:19,25 101:25</p> <p>attorney 6:7 24:11 35:21 38:14,21 39:5, 6 42:6 43:22,23 45:2 65:17 70:13 80:15 87:6 93:20,21 97:13 99:9,21,22,24 100:2</p> <p>attorney-client 65:20 79:9</p> <p>attorneys 87:11</p> <p>attraction 32:18,21</p> <p>authority 15:9,19 33:24</p> <p>authorize 96:6 97:11</p> <p>authorized 45:4 88:10,18 98:18</p> <p>aware 27:13 34:12 36:2 38:12 40:5,9 58:10 62:14,19 69:21 71:20,21 72:8,11 73:24 74:8,17 76:11 77:19 79:16,18,25 80:16,17 82:22 83:21 85:5 102:10 103:25</p>
---	---	--	--	--

105:2,23	beneficial 58:14,16	cancellation 100:14	14,20 56:8 58:15 60:3,25 65:8	77:5,13,20 79:19 80:2,12 82:2,11 84:14,20 85:21 92:9 93:25 96:10 97:4 98:8,23 99:15 100:19 101:5 102:3,14 103:6,10,17,23 104:3 105:4,22 106:4
B	beneficiaries 61:8, 12 101:20 103:6	CANTY 55:6,9	Charles 105:13	CLO's 35:14
back 20:21 54:18 56:18,20 81:21 87:25 88:15 106:17	beneficiary 61:19 73:9	capacity 17:9 18:20 26:21 34:5,7 50:2 51:20 72:25 73:23 74:7 75:24 83:22 84:20	chart 46:25 48:16 55:20	CLOS 13:13 68:6 69:3,16 70:23 71:18, 22,24 72:9,11,21 74:25 75:16,19 76:20,25 77:13 83:7, 23 84:5,9,14 85:17 86:4 87:10 89:3,12 90:8 98:11
background 24:17 99:6	big 33:3 39:8	Capital 6:10 13:18, 19,22 14:16 19:18 28:12 62:15,21,25 67:21 68:5,11,19,24 69:14 70:19,22 71:21 72:12,16,21 73:25 74:10 75:2,17	chemical 29:4	close 30:17
bankruptcy 6:9 22:9,19,21,24 23:5, 14 30:14,15 34:11,13 35:19 76:12,15,18,23 77:6 84:23 85:12,15 100:11	biggest 23:16	Capital's 68:19	choice 10:2	closest 28:20,21 31:23
Barbara 52:15 56:12, 13,23 58:10	bit 8:15 30:18 52:19 55:12	caps 13:10	chose 29:11	collateralized 10:23
base 98:19	black 100:4	care 107:6,8	Christmas 90:22	collectively 20:25 80:18
based 29:9 61:5,15 65:20 73:16 80:22 104:23	blocks 52:13	Carolina 25:8	chronological 34:20	college 28:22 29:7
bases 98:13 99:7	board 34:25	carry 18:4,13	City 52:15 56:13	Colorado 67:3
basically 20:22 24:6	bottom 46:24 55:22	carving 104:19	claim 23:11,22,24 38:10,11 39:11,12, 19,23 40:4,8,12,13, 16 46:22 52:25	com- 20:15 25:24 102:19
basis 19:25 21:4 24:13 26:9 37:15 42:17 60:13 82:19 86:5 91:4 98:8 101:17 102:10,13	box 105:21	caused 74:11 84:19	claims 95:16	comfortable 85:2 98:19
be- 97:6	boxes 47:13	cash 36:13 37:9	clarify 13:3 43:18,19	comments 79:3,8,10
began 25:4	breach 68:12 74:9, 15,18 103:17	categories 99:18	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	commonly 12:16
begin 6:13 7:4 8:20 16:22 99:15	breached 67:21	causing 99:14	clerk 60:18	communicate 90:4
behalf 10:11 14:2,12 15:20 16:3 26:25 27:17,23 33:25 34:4 37:22 40:22 67:17 77:20 78:18 84:5,9, 14 85:17 86:4 87:10 88:14 89:2,11 96:9 105:3	break 19:7 61:24 99:17 106:14	caution 44:11 65:16, 18 79:7	CLO 10:15,21 11:8 12:2,7,11,15,20,23, 25 13:23 14:2,12 15:10,20,24 16:4,6,9, 11,15,20 17:5,15,18, 22 18:21,25 19:3,15, 17,20 21:5 22:10 23:2,9,18 24:3 26:25 27:17,23 28:6 32:10, 23 33:6,15,25 34:8 35:17 36:12,23 37:7, 22 40:22 41:11 42:20 45:19,20 46:2,3,15, 22 47:3,7,17 48:23 50:14 51:3 52:25 54:15 58:21 61:8 62:12,16 63:2 64:20 67:17,22 68:13,18 69:3,13,16,22 70:4, 19,23 72:8,19 74:3,8, 9,24 75:25 76:2,19	communicated 39:4 62:24
behoove 96:9	brought 82:4	caveats 83:18	clerical 60:18	communicating 67:5
belief 73:13,14,15 86:5 106:10,12	bucket 71:20	Cayman 47:4	CLO 10:15,21 11:8 12:2,7,11,15,20,23, 25 13:23 14:2,12 15:10,20,24 16:4,6,9, 11,15,20 17:5,15,18, 22 18:21,25 19:3,15, 17,20 21:5 22:10 23:2,9,18 24:3 26:25 27:17,23 28:6 32:10, 23 33:6,15,25 34:8 35:17 36:12,23 37:7, 22 40:22 41:11 42:20 45:19,20 46:2,3,15, 22 47:3,7,17 48:23 50:14 51:3 52:25 54:15 58:21 61:8 62:12,16 63:2 64:20 67:17,22 68:13,18 69:3,13,16,22 70:4, 19,23 72:8,19 74:3,8, 9,24 75:25 76:2,19	communication 45:6
believed 42:16 67:20 68:11 91:4	bunch 104:19	certainty 33:20	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	communications 44:14 64:8,23 65:12, 20 66:21 67:15 68:16 80:22,25 87:5
believes 98:9	business 29:19 50:4	change 27:10	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	company 10:22 33:9,21 65:23
	business/finance 29:22	changed 20:23 38:21 84:19	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	compensation 16:19 17:2 49:20,25
	C	charge 20:16	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	
	call 18:6 35:4,19,20 44:9 45:11 91:8 93:17,18,24 95:12,14 96:15 97:16	char- 51:16	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	
	called 6:3 10:15 35:9,20 44:6 45:12 46:7 87:22,25 93:7,9	characterize 94:3 101:13	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	
	calls 93:16	charitable 11:3,4 12:14 17:24 18:4,14 32:13,17,20 36:16 47:8,22 48:15 49:3,4, 7,10,13,17,21 50:3, 10,16,23 51:2,10,13, 17,23 52:3,6,9,10 53:3,5,17,25 54:10,	CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	
	camp 75:13		CLARK 26:5,12 31:2, 10 32:25 33:8,17 39:14 40:24 42:24 44:10 54:4 59:14 62:3 64:4,10 65:15 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:5 74:4,12,19 75:18 79:6,14 80:21 83:13 87:18 92:17 106:7 107:3,10	

complain 102:11	contend 69:13 72:19 106:4	courtroom 7:23	Dece- 78:14	derived 24:7 81:11
complaining 94:5	contentious 66:2	Covitz 14:20 15:2 86:15,20	December 78:8,15, 23 79:18 91:9,20 93:19 94:12 96:13, 19,24 105:6,8,14,18	describe 10:20 23:23 24:16 30:5 66:20 94:21
complex 18:19	continue 104:4	cr- 99:5	decide 82:2,12	describing 93:19
compliance 18:11 20:3,13,16 25:16,17, 20,24 50:8	contract 36:17	create 17:24	decided 82:23 83:3	desire 85:13
comports 47:2	contracts 101:8	created 18:3 36:20	deciding 91:9	detail 11:7
con- 85:8	conversation 66:12, 25 88:4 90:15,25 93:5	creditor 23:9,21	decision 34:3,9 36:3, 4,18 37:14,18,21 38:19,21,23 39:8 43:10,21 45:15,16 47:25 48:10 66:15 74:24 81:18 86:7,8 98:16,22 99:11	details 10:6
concern 37:5 68:17 71:6,14	conversations 65:4 66:8 73:16 90:16	cutter 18:9	decision-makers 84:24	detected 60:21
conclude 86:20 87:8	converting 83:16	D	decision-making 15:9,18 33:14,24 85:20,21 86:17,21	devote 21:2,5 22:10
conditional 98:14	cookie 18:9	D-A-F 13:10	decisions 13:25 14:12 16:3 26:25 34:14,23 48:7 75:5 85:2	devoting 22:18
conducted 6:19	copies 97:17	DA- 51:23	declared 30:16	difference 22:5 39:7 83:15
conference 35:9	copy 78:23	DAF 12:17,20,23,25 13:9 19:20 47:8 48:15 49:3,4,7,10,13, 17,22 50:3,10,16,23 51:2,10,13,17,23 52:3,6,9,11 53:3,5, 17,25 54:11,14 56:8 58:15 60:3,25	declined 40:23	difficult 30:18 41:17 69:11 99:3
conferring 99:9	core 15:5,8	Dallas 52:14,18 55:19 56:2,22 58:9	dedicate 21:14	diligence 107:7
confide 31:17	corner 46:25	damaged 106:5	default 68:5,12 74:9 103:22	direct 103:6
confided 31:9	corporate 11:7 73:2	dated 52:20 78:15 82:25 83:2 90:17 96:19 105:18	define 31:17	directly 28:8
confidential 32:3	correct 10:13 16:14 17:10,13 23:15 25:25 53:14 58:17 71:13 77:2,3 84:18 88:12 90:18 91:21 98:25 102:15	day 21:9,12,19 42:14 96:20 97:3 107:19	degree 24:22	director 11:11 12:2,7 16:16,20,25 17:4,13 18:21 19:3,17 21:5 22:25 26:21 28:5 32:9 34:5,8 35:6 47:17 48:24 50:22 51:3,4,12,16 52:3,6 55:25 56:6,11,15,25 57:8,11 58:9 62:12 73:23 74:7 75:24 76:24 84:20 90:5
confirmation 6:14 104:13	corrected 60:21	day-to-day 12:9 19:25 50:6	Delaware 29:5	directors 15:24 49:14 50:20 55:2,18 59:12,18
confused 40:25 47:13 53:11 99:3	correction 60:22	days 21:21,25 83:12 96:3,6	delayed 70:10 71:11	disagree 88:23 89:4
confusing 13:3 53:19	correctly 23:12 29:20 36:7 42:10	DDDD 78:5	demand 81:8 83:17, 19	disagreed 34:10,15
confusion 85:9	cos- 77:23	de 52:16 101:21	Demo 78:7 96:23	disagreement 38:13
connection 62:11 69:2 74:2 101:9	counsel 10:9 11:23 23:6 36:8 43:12 44:12,15 73:17 79:8 80:23,25 85:23 91:13 95:16	de- 31:16	demonstrative 46:7 56:21	disclose 44:13 65:19 80:24
consent 27:16,22 55:2,18	counterparties 100:19	deal 20:13	deposed 7:10 8:12	discuss 42:19 67:16
consideration 76:6	couple 18:17	debtor 6:9 23:9,10, 12,22,25 86:3 88:15 89:2 96:7 98:9	deposition 6:12,17 7:9,18,23 8:2 9:8 23:7	discussed 73:20 77:8,11 81:13
considered 91:14	Cournoyer 15:4	debtor's 41:12 77:12 90:7 92:11	depositions 7:13 8:16	discussion 67:23 80:16 85:23 89:7 92:23 93:3
consistent 33:22 91:19	court 6:21 35:19 41:16 42:14,20 43:13 80:4 82:5,14,22 83:6, 12 96:3	debtors 97:5		
construction 67:2	courtesy 8:24			
consulted 39:5 42:7				
contact 21:19,20,22 103:14				
contacted 38:21				
contacts 87:24 88:2				
contained 69:22				

discussions 64:3 67:19 68:3,10 dispute 35:15 disputes 94:11 distinction 70:24 distinguish 70:17 distracted 33:4 72:4 division 53:10 document 9:12,14 46:9 54:22 55:14,22 73:12 89:9 105:5 documents 9:9,10 52:24 66:24 Don- 11:21 donated 24:4 Dondero 7:21 9:17 10:7 11:24 14:20,25 17:24 28:7,9,10,14, 16 29:24 30:6,25 31:5,9,20 32:2,22 33:5 34:10 35:24 37:2,23 39:12,19 41:7 42:20 43:10 45:9 48:7 51:19,22 52:2,5 57:4,8 58:12 60:23 61:13 62:20 63:19 67:7 84:12,17, 24 85:5 86:9,12 89:4 90:12,13,16 91:3,8, 20 92:8,23 93:18,23 94:16 105:23 Dondero's 7:19 10:11 30:21 47:21 57:21 58:2 60:11,14 67:3 106:5 downward 54:13 draft 78:25 92:24 dry 19:5 due 35:17 70:11 Dugaboy 59:25 60:5, 15,19 61:7,19 duly 6:3 duties 12:6 19:2,16 62:11 69:15	<hr/> E <hr/> e-mailed 66:23 earlier 25:17 26:24 62:9 75:4 77:16 78:25 79:16 82:3,12 83:12 85:4 87:20 92:19 earnestly 89:20 easier 12:23 42:5 Eastern 61:25 easy 89:19 educational 24:17 effect 37:9 effects 100:10 effectuated 27:23 effectuating 27:16 electrical 24:18 Electronics 8:6 employee 14:16 16:17 90:5 employees 11:21,22 14:17 16:7 17:11 26:23 27:15,22 40:3 49:11 50:17,18 57:15 59:12,19 100:14 end 55:12 91:24 105:24 ended 35:20 engage 87:10 89:10 95:25 engaged 88:14 engaging 82:6 83:7 93:25 95:9 engineer 24:18 25:2 29:5 engineering 29:17 entities 11:2 12:12 17:25 18:3,7,10 46:2 54:16 55:20 56:8 78:18 79:19 80:2 82:4,13 89:8 90:6 96:8 105:4	entity 10:15,18 12:3, 25 13:4 17:12,25 51:9 52:17 58:15 74:24 81:11 85:19 entity's 50:4 Equity 70:9 equivalent 11:4 error 60:18,19 escrow 37:14 essentially 83:17 establish 23:11 47:25 48:7,10 65:6 established 51:18 58:20 estimate 21:3,24 estimated 21:12 et al 78:7 96:23 evaluate 98:17 event 66:6 events 30:14 36:7 evicted 105:24 eviction 106:6 evidence 6:17 evidenced 42:12 ex-wife 10:9,11 exam- 86:15 EXAMINATION 7:5 examined 6:4 exclusive 23:20 24:13 exclusively 24:10 50:14 excuse 21:11 22:15 23:7,9 28:25 104:12 execute 32:16 86:4 exhibit 46:7,13,14 54:24,25 55:7 78:4,5, 6,8,11 96:22,24 105:10,12 exist 75:16	existence 12:3 exiting 77:5 expenses 36:14 64:15 experience 8:16 expert 25:13,24 expertise 76:8 84:25 86:3 88:5 89:10 experts 100:12 explain 17:21 75:10 explained 45:14 explored 98:20 extend 8:23 extent 26:13 79:7 80:22 <hr/> F <hr/> fact 6:19 76:16 88:14 factors 99:13 facts 46:10 47:2 102:7,19 103:24 factual 98:8 fair 8:21 16:2 22:8 30:13,24 31:8,18,25 37:19 39:11 47:22,24 73:3,5 85:12,17 88:11 fairly 18:19 36:12 fall 25:5 familiar 10:14 45:20, 24 47:12 100:20,22 familiarity 45:25 47:11 family 7:20 9:17 feed 52:12 56:7 feedback 82:8 feeds 52:13 feel 98:18 fees 36:15 felt 84:25	field 25:13 filed 20:5 23:5 38:24 39:13,20 40:17,18 42:8 76:12,15 filing 22:22,24 23:13 39:22 76:18,24 77:6 83:16 final 15:8,18 33:13,24 finance 18:2 25:10 29:18 Finances 19:23 financial 20:10 85:20 finish 8:19 firm 6:8 flow 36:13 37:7,11 flows 54:6,13,18 focus 23:20 36:24 68:8 93:22 folks 62:10 footnote 46:23 forget 26:15 35:7 52:18 forgive 69:9 forgot 19:8 form 26:6,9,10,13 31:2,10 32:25 33:8, 17 37:8 39:14 40:24 42:24 54:4 59:14 64:4,10 69:5,18,24 72:22 73:7 74:4,12, 19 75:18 83:13 86:2 87:18 92:17 106:7 formal 25:9,15 formed 17:15,19,22 47:4 98:22 formulated 82:18 forward 7:2 42:18 98:15 102:21 104:14 found 9:24 36:5,7 45:9 foundation 11:4 52:14 55:19 56:2,5, 22,23 65:8 82:20
--	---	--	--	--

Index: foundation-like..inclusion

foundation-like 17:25 foundations 12:15 53:22,23 54:10,17 56:7,10 57:5,9,12,15, 20,25 58:10,12 fourth 52:15,17 53:24 frankly 76:9 free 80:23 frequently 12:21,24 13:3,5 Friday 21:15 friend 28:13,21 31:23 friends 28:20 friendship 30:17 frivolous 96:4 full 70:7 84:21 101:18 function 18:14 fund 47:8 48:15 49:4 50:10,17,23 51:2 52:6,11 53:5,18 54:10,11 future 98:2,3 103:3 104:20 <hr/> G <hr/> gamut 20:5 gave 43:21 86:19 87:4 97:13 general 18:9 45:25 49:3 66:7 83:2 generally 7:17 8:17 24:17 25:22 30:8,11 45:19,23 63:14 66:7, 20 71:12 gentle 83:17 91:15 get all 102:8 get- 20:4 give 77:4 106:16 giving 36:16 47:22 goal 18:4	good 6:6 7:7 26:20 30:8,9 43:25 58:23, 25 59:5,9,11,17,22 61:6,12 good-faith 42:17 GP 49:3,8,10,13,17, 22 50:3 51:24 graduate 24:20 graduated 24:13,19 25:5 Grant 6:1,12 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1,13 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1,10 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1,2,4 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1, 15 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1,6 80:1,21 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1,16 grateful 89:18 106:15 Gregory 78:7 96:23 group 11:18,19 14:15 15:6,8,21 18:7 19:21 86:14 grow 28:16 guess 11:24 12:22 18:2 20:20 25:2 40:4, 5 42:13 45:7 65:23 78:11 99:17,21 guide 97:14	guideline 27:8,14 guys 100:3 107:8 <hr/> H <hr/> half 43:6 60:21 halt 81:8 hand 70:20 handled 8:10 20:7 happen 92:8 101:8 103:2 happened 100:11 Har- 38:17 Harbourvest 38:18 40:20 41:3,8,12,15, 25 43:11 hard 21:13 harm 94:14 HCLO 73:22,23 HCM 76:11 head 28:11 heads 28:12 hear 13:9 48:5 55:7 heard 20:22 51:9 hearing 6:18 42:15, 23 43:4 83:5 held 33:15 helped 65:6 helps 54:22 Hey 44:10 hierarchy 11:18,20 23:16 65:7 high 23:17,18 28:15 Highland 6:10 11:22 13:18,19,22 14:3,15, 16 19:18 20:7 26:23 27:14,22 28:12 34:25 40:2 52:14 55:19,25 56:22 62:11,15,21,25 63:17 67:6,21 68:4, 11,19,24 69:14 70:9, 12,18,22 71:11,21 72:12,16,20 73:25	74:10 75:2,17 76:3,9, 14,21 77:2,6 80:5 81:10,11 82:6,14 83:6,22,24 84:4,8,13 85:6,14,16,18 89:4 93:24 94:7 98:4 101:4,17 102:9,14,16 103:17,22 104:2,9, 10,12 105:3 106:6 Highland's 35:14 98:24 102:2 105:24 highly 44:7 hindsight 26:19 historically 86:7 HOGWOOD 107:11 hold 25:12,23 48:14 65:15 79:6 106:11 Holdco 10:15,21 11:9 12:2,7,16,20,23 13:23 14:2,12 15:10, 20,24 16:4,6,9,11,15, 20 17:5,15,18,22 18:21 19:3,17,20 21:5 22:10 23:2 26:25 27:17,24 28:6 32:10,23 33:6,16,25 34:8 36:12,23 37:7, 22 40:22 41:11 42:21 45:19,21 46:2,3,15, 22 47:3,7,17 48:23 50:14 51:3,10,13,17 52:9,25 53:3,25 54:11,14,15 56:8 58:15,21 60:3,25 61:9 62:12,16 63:2 64:20 68:13,18 69:4, 13,17,22 70:4,19,23 72:8,19 73:22,24 74:8,24 75:25 76:19 77:13,21 79:19 80:2, 13 82:2,11 84:21 97:4 98:8,23 105:4, 22 106:4 Holdco's 85:21 103:10 holding 10:22 53:4 home 67:2,3 honestly 89:20	horizontal 52:13 house 30:4 housemates 30:2,3 Hun- 86:16 hundred 53:6 89:15 Hunter 14:20 86:15, 20 <hr/> I <hr/> IBM 24:23 idea 47:20 identification 46:16 55:3 78:9 96:25 105:15 identified 23:13 26:24 35:10 53:23 60:18 81:5 82:5 identify 14:11 30:11 34:16,21 52:14 63:16 88:21,25 90:10 III 78:7 96:23 Illinois 24:21 im- 91:5 94:17 imaginable 91:16 immediately 24:23 35:20,21 impacted 103:10,11 implement 47:21 important 8:18 34:22,23 impression 86:25 87:4 impro- 94:17 improper 91:6 94:18 improvements 67:2 in- 37:15 70:3 inappropriate 95:15 including 10:23 36:14 86:15 inclusion 97:25
---	---	--	--	---

Index: inconsistent..mail

inconsistent 92:15 incorrect 37:15 independent 34:25 35:6 indirect 61:8 indirectly 28:8 individual 72:25 individuals 65:6 information 32:3 40:3 46:21 48:19 86:19 87:8 91:13 103:16,21 106:8 informed 86:23 88:4 informing 42:20 initially 23:3,19 29:2 32:19 54:12 83:2 innocuous 81:7 input 11:24 93:4 inquire 95:24 inquiries 40:6 inquiry 88:7,9 Institute 24:24 institution 18:6 instruct 95:21 insulating 18:12 integrated 11:2 intent 98:2,3,16,17 inter- 14:14 interact 49:23 interactions 73:19 interchangeably 12:18,19 13:6 interest 47:14,15 54:17 60:2,25 interested 10:6 interests 52:10 53:5, 17 54:20 interface 12:10 13:12 14:14,22 19:21 20:12 40:2 64:13	interfaced 62:10 70:11 interfacing 18:24 19:14 intermittent 21:13 internal 27:8 internally 27:12 interrupt 89:17 interrupted 26:16 invest 74:25 invested 69:4,17 77:14 investing 25:10 investment 13:25 14:11 16:3 25:13 26:4,24 59:25 60:6, 15 61:7,19 75:5 76:2 investments 15:10, 19 27:5 33:24 72:9 invests 70:23 involved 14:22 86:16,21 IRS 18:11 Islands 47:4 issue 7:20 36:5,9,12 37:4,13,17 38:17 40:14 41:7,24 42:15, 19 70:9 74:13 81:9 82:17 94:4 97:18,20, 23 100:5 102:12,17, 20 issuer 102:2 104:15 issuers 100:20,23 101:4 102:25 103:16, 22,25 issues 20:4,14 25:16,17 36:13 38:8 70:3 81:14,15 92:10 99:5 100:10 101:22 102:11	January 88:15 Jeffrey 105:12 Jersey 28:18 Jim 7:19,21 11:21,24 14:20 17:23 28:7,8, 10 35:4 45:8 61:13 63:5,19 67:3,9,23 84:12,16,23 87:14, 15,19 88:22 89:10 90:12 91:3 94:16 95:12,14 John 6:7 7:8 26:6 35:7 55:6 82:7 107:5 join 80:13,18,20 82:12,15 91:9 joined 24:23 97:4 Jones 6:8 junior 29:7 justify 82:19	law 6:8 7:20 24:14,15 25:4,5,7 42:17 94:25 100:5 lawyer 10:10 24:8,12 65:23 lawyers 18:3 91:16 95:21 lays 101:16 learn 42:22 76:14 83:21,24 learned 43:3 learning 37:18 led 81:15 86:19 87:8 left 51:8 85:5,9 87:24 89:4 legal 18:10 82:19 100:4 102:12 104:20 legalistic 94:17,23 lesser 34:22 letter 77:20,25 78:6, 14,19,22 79:21,23 81:2,3,5 82:24 83:10 85:24 87:12 88:11,19 90:17 91:2,10,15,19, 25 92:25 93:21 95:23 96:7,9,13,15,22 97:4, 8,12,17,18,24 100:4 105:3,6,12,17 letters 79:16 98:15 Lieu 55:2 light 77:6 likelihood 94:10 limited 10:15,21 11:9 12:2,8,13,24 13:23 14:2,12 15:10,20 16:4,6,11 17:5,16,18 18:21 19:3,17 21:6 23:2 26:25 27:17,24 32:10,23 33:7,16,25 34:8 37:23 40:22 41:11 42:21 47:3,7, 17 51:3,10,13,17 52:9,10 53:3,4,17,25 54:11,14 56:8 58:15 60:3,25 61:9 62:12, 16 63:2 64:20 68:14, 18 69:4,13 70:19	72:9,19 73:24 74:8, 24 75:25 77:13,21 79:20 80:2,6,13 82:2, 12 97:4 98:8,23 106:4 Limited's 52:25 69:23 76:20 lines 55:23 liquid 37:9 Lisa 13:8 list 27:21 listed 79:20 80:3 82:13 89:8 105:5 listened 93:3 litigation 8:9 36:9 94:10 lived 29:25 LLC 49:3,8,10,13,17, 22 50:3 51:24 loan 10:23 long 28:14 69:8 100:12 longer 14:21 85:22 86:8,16,20 87:2,9 106:3 looked 94:3 100:16 loop 82:8 loosely 11:3 lot 13:9 lower 46:25
	J James 78:6 96:22	K Kansas 52:15 56:13 kind 9:11 22:4 knowing 98:21 knowledge 25:19 27:2 37:23 47:6,21 48:3,6,13 49:2 52:8 57:3,7 61:3,15 64:21 83:11 84:10 98:19 103:15,20	L L.P. 6:11 47:8 48:15 49:4 50:11,17,23 51:2 52:3,6,11 53:5, 18 76:11 La 46:12 lack 95:11 laid 82:20 language 98:14 large 19:21 20:23 late 23:4 76:16,17	M made 15:19 27:5 34:9,14,23 36:4 37:22 38:20 43:12 44:23 45:2 47:25 48:9 66:15 70:15 72:9 73:6 74:23 76:19,24 77:22 80:3, 10 81:19 83:11 88:9, 22 89:2 91:4,5,18 92:16 96:2 99:11,12 mail 87:25

Index: maintain..outlined

maintain 18:12 20:13 85:24 91:16 maintaining 94:4 make 16:3 26:24 34:3 48:7 70:13 75:5,14 82:14 87:16 97:16 101:25 makes 13:25 14:11 54:15 making 67:17 70:25 75:13 76:2 79:21 80:6 83:22 84:5,8,13 85:2,10 86:7,8 88:7 man 30:22 Man- 68:19 manage 19:19 20:11 managed 72:12 74:25 75:17 76:3,21 77:2,5 management 6:11 13:2,18,19,22 14:16 19:24 28:13 32:23 33:6,15 36:15 62:15, 21,25 67:21 68:5,12, 25 69:14 70:19,21,22 71:22 72:12,17,21 73:25 74:3,9,11 75:17 77:10,12 96:11 98:25 99:16 100:19 101:8 102:3,15 103:6,18,23 104:3 Management's 68:20 manager 12:10 13:13,16 14:8 18:25 19:15 69:3,16 98:10 managerial 47:14 managers 14:3 manages 13:19,22 33:9 70:22 71:23 101:5 managing 33:11 49:7,21 50:3 51:23 Mark 14:20 63:21 marked 46:15 55:3 78:9 96:25 105:14	married 30:19,20 master's 24:22 material 100:9 101:21 matter 7:17 9:18,21 64:2,8 66:8 matters 25:3 meaningfully 21:23 means 11:12 meet 18:13 Meeting 55:2 Mel- 63:21 Melissa 63:21 66:17 member 49:7,21 50:3 51:23 men's 44:8 mental 94:3 mention 14:5 94:24 105:21 mentioned 7:8 13:12 14:4 20:18 22:13,14 25:17 41:3,6 53:24 66:17 71:5,10 77:16 81:16 86:23 95:2 met 81:14 metric 27:12 middle 16:23 94:12 Mike 63:20 Miller 105:13 mind 53:3 mine 28:13 Minimal 25:21 minus 52:16 101:21 minutes 106:18 missing 52:18 mission 32:20 mistaken 85:6 moment 11:8 99:25 Monday 90:23 94:20	Mondays 21:14 monetary 104:21 money 12:15 14:8 19:23 32:19 36:18,19 37:6,10 54:6,13,18 58:20 month 21:25 monthly 21:4 months 23:20 30:15 63:18 64:25 65:12 66:22 67:7 morning 21:21 Morris 6:6,7 7:6,8 13:8,11 26:11,17 31:3,11 39:15 42:25 44:20 46:12,17 54:23 55:4,8,10,11,13,21, 24 56:20 59:15 61:23 62:4,8 64:5,11 65:22 66:5 73:3,8 78:3,10, 13 79:11 81:21,25 91:24 92:3 96:14,17 97:2 105:10,16 106:13,23 107:6 motion 41:12 42:8, 13 45:8 80:4,9,14 81:15 82:3,13,16 mouth 19:4 move 42:17 45:17 51:8 81:22 104:14 multiple 21:20 83:18 98:13 <hr/> N <hr/> named 33:11 names 86:13 Nancy 60:22 nature 23:24 32:8 50:4 64:17,22 65:3, 11 94:18 100:16 necessarily 11:11 needed 27:5 66:24 negotiating 104:2 Nelms 35:5	network 18:3 night 21:21 no-cause 101:22 Nobody's 7:3 nomenclature 42:10 Nonexempt 58:23 59:2,5,9,11,18,23 61:7 nonfinance 99:6 nonliquid 37:8 nonresponsive 81:23 North 25:8 northern 28:18 Notary 6:4 note 72:23 Noted 107:12 notwithstanding 6:18 76:23 number 20:23 52:25 54:24 63:10 87:21,23 99:5 nuts 19:23 70:6 <hr/> O <hr/> object 26:5,12 39:23 40:21 41:11 69:5 72:22 73:7 objected 37:24 38:19 41:25 84:16 100:6 objecting 26:8 40:10 42:8 101:17 objection 6:22 26:9, 20 31:2,10 32:25 33:8,17 38:2 39:14 40:24 42:2,8,21,24 43:11 54:4 59:14 64:4,10 69:18,23,24 74:4,12,19 75:18 83:13 87:18 92:17 100:7 101:16 104:25 106:7	objections 6:25 38:24 39:3 69:20 101:24 obligation-type 10:23 obligations 24:2 36:14 37:11 obtain 27:15 54:17 obtained 23:6 91:13 occasion 27:2,3 occasions 7:11 occurred 23:8 25:22 38:9,18 95:7 occurs 21:17 October 7:14,18 62:22 63:3 85:7 office 20:21 officer 16:16 90:5 officers 16:12 17:12 49:14 50:19 57:20,25 58:11 59:12,18 offices 105:24 106:6 Okada 14:25 Okada's 14:21 ongoing 74:14 91:4 operating 104:4 operations 50:6 opinion 86:2 87:15 order 34:20 80:5 82:14 organically 25:22 organization 10:25 20:6 Organizational 46:14 original 38:9 40:8,13 81:3 82:24 originally 58:20 out- 101:23 outlined 69:19 101:23
--	--	--	--	--

Index: overpaying..recess

overpaying 70:8	Patrick's 65:17	69:20,23 92:11 100:5 101:9,16 104:25	prepared 46:6	51:3 54:23 78:3 105:10
overrode 42:2	pausing 34:19		present 60:19	
overruled 37:25 39:24	paying 70:4	planner 20:10	president 57:4,21 58:2	putting 75:13
owed 24:3	payment 36:14 70:10,14 71:11	play 11:8 32:22 33:5	prevented 80:5	<hr/> Q <hr/>
owned 13:23 47:7 71:24	people 12:21 18:2 19:21 20:3,23 32:5 33:10 65:24 75:13,14 86:7	played 35:3	previous 73:19	qualified 87:16
owner 58:14,16	perc- 89:15	pleasant 35:10	previously 24:4 33:11,19 81:12,13 86:14 87:2 98:6	quest 70:2
owners 53:25 54:2	percent 47:7 52:9 53:4,7,9,11,14,16	point 18:5 32:18 35:16,24 36:5,10 40:3 64:15 81:6 99:21	prior 16:25 27:2,4,16, 22 33:22 34:11 40:16 43:11 79:18 80:10 88:10,17 97:17 104:15,16	question 8:19 10:5 14:9 19:9,13 26:6,15, 19 36:25 43:7 44:22, 24 48:20 79:12 81:22,24 82:9 88:17 89:13,23 92:21 99:4 103:13
ownership 45:20 47:14	percent/99 53:9	points 81:6	privilege 65:21 66:4 79:9	questions 8:18 50:12,16 55:12 69:8 89:21 106:25 107:4, 11
owns 53:16	perfectly 91:19	policy 27:21	problem 70:4 102:21	quickly 35:22
<hr/> P <hr/>	perform 50:5	Pomerantz 105:13	problems 36:21	quo 85:25 91:17 94:4
p.m. 62:6,7 106:21,22 107:12	performance 68:20 69:2,15 102:3,11	pool 32:24 33:7,10	proceedings 62:6 106:21	<hr/> R <hr/>
Pachulski 6:8	period 22:15,16 23:19 80:6	portfolio 10:25 69:3, 16 98:10,24	proceeds 37:9	raised 74:13 92:10
paid 32:20	periodically 18:18 102:9	portion 10:24	process 86:17,21 97:14 99:15 104:18	rang 87:22
par- 54:19	permit 104:2	portions 9:14	program 29:22	re- 66:11 72:7 82:9 100:7
paragraph 78:17 79:21 80:3 82:5,13	pers- 79:20	pose 70:3	proof 38:9,11 40:4,8, 12,13 46:22	reach 95:21
part 11:2 23:13 66:3 68:18 101:14	person 8:8 14:11 15:18 20:15 49:16 64:16 90:10	position 23:21 48:14 62:20 66:11 76:20 100:8	proofs 39:11,12,19, 23	read 9:14 73:12
partial 101:11,13	personal 30:10	possibly 27:25 36:7 99:14	provide 79:3	reason 9:13 34:19 68:24 76:5
Partially 101:10	personally 11:8	post- 104:12	provided 74:2 79:8	reasons 29:11 67:16
participate 54:5 82:3	persons 14:13 90:11	postbankruptcy 21:10 22:6,16 104:11,13	provisions 104:19	recall 10:3 14:24 28:2 35:25 44:22 50:8 58:7 63:23 64:2, 7,22 65:9,11 67:5 73:19 80:16 90:24 94:24 97:3
participation 52:17 54:17,20	perspective 100:17	postplan 104:13	Public 6:4	receive 12:15 16:19 49:20,24
parties 6:16 13:5 83:6	philosophy 26:4	potentially 104:20	publicly 32:4	received 9:25 24:22 34:24 45:6
partner 49:4	phone 23:6 44:9 63:10 65:24 87:22 91:8 95:7,12,14	power 33:14	pull 54:21	recently 38:18 73:18
partnership 52:10 53:4,17	phrase 13:9	practical 100:10 104:21	pulled 42:15	recess 62:5 106:20
parts 92:19	pick 95:7	pre 22:15	purportedly 77:20	
party 72:20	piece 21:16	prebankruptcy 21:9 22:5	purposes 18:11,12 50:7	
past 7:14,18	pieces 71:5	precise 69:10	pursuant 9:22 70:21 71:23 72:16 101:4	
patent 8:5,9,11,14 24:8,10,12 99:20 100:2	place 7:13 66:13	preclude 101:18	put 9:10 21:8 34:20 37:14 46:13 50:25	
Patrick 63:21 64:18, 24 65:13 66:9 67:8	plan 38:24 47:21	precludes 21:22		
		predefined 36:17		
		preliminary 99:10		

recite 82:9	removal 84:23 104:23	resigning 66:11	S	Seery 35:4 63:5,7,13 67:9,16,19,24 68:3, 10,17 77:9,12 87:16, 19 88:13,22 89:10 95:8,12,14,22
recognize 87:23	remove 81:10 98:4	resolutions 46:21 53:2	sales 74:14 81:8 91:4 94:8,9	select 70:9 71:12 75:3
recollection 8:3 18:18 23:15 63:13 85:6 94:22 97:5 105:9	removed 86:24 98:9	resolve 42:15	Samsung 8:6	selected 56:3,4
recommendation 43:23 44:5,7,23 45:2	reorganization 100:6 101:9	resolved 92:12	Santa 52:15 56:12, 13,23 58:10	selection 75:7,12,14
reconvene 61:24	repeat 14:8 15:16 33:2 41:2,18 72:5 89:22 90:3	resonates 99:19,22 100:3	scenario 45:7	sell 76:19
record 6:14,25 72:23 73:6 100:13	rephrase 89:23	respect 7:21 9:17 12:12,14 25:16 33:6, 14 36:13 38:9,17 40:8,11,20 41:24 48:15 50:9 64:20 67:3 68:18 71:17 79:23 101:14	scheduled 36:16	send 45:11
recurring 27:11	replacement 84:24	respective 6:16	school 24:14,15,21 25:4,5,7 28:15 29:17, 19	sending 88:11,18 95:23 96:7 97:11
reduced 40:12	report 18:21	responsibilities 12:7,9 19:2,16	Schroth 63:22 66:18, 21 67:8	sentence 92:5
reduces 94:10	reporter 6:21 44:3 55:10 107:9	responsibility 64:19	scientist 24:25	sequence 36:6 93:15
refer 11:3 20:21 100:18	reports 102:8	responsible 86:14	scott 6:1,12 7:1,7 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1,14,18 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1, 2,4 52:1 53:1 54:1,25 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1,9 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1,24 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1,6 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1,22 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1,12 106:1,15,23 107:1,16	series 8:18
reference 78:18	represent 74:15	responsive 69:25	restate 82:9	serve 10:7 30:21 32:9 51:19,22 52:2,5 57:4
referred 12:16 70:5	representation 100:15	restate 82:9	reveal 32:4	served 10:3,11 16:24 17:8,13
referring 13:17 60:10 65:7 86:11	representative 16:15 73:2,4 89:8 90:5	review 83:4	reviewed 100:7	serves 60:15
reflected 48:8	represented 95:15	Ri- 78:11	rights 101:19 103:9, 10 104:23	service 19:19 57:21 58:2 90:7
reflects 46:10	representing 6:15	right-hand 46:25	rise 82:17	servicer 62:17 72:13,17 83:23 98:4, 10 104:16
refresh 18:18 105:9	represents 6:9	role 11:8 12:2,12,13 20:19 32:22 33:5 48:17,22 76:7	room 6:21 9:8 35:9 44:8	services 16:20 68:9, 13,21 70:5,6,7,18 71:6,7,15 74:2 81:12
regard 38:25	request 34:24 35:2, 11,22 42:16 70:2,14 77:16,21 79:22 81:8 83:10,11,16,17,18 84:21 91:5,16,18 92:4,15 96:2 98:14	rules 25:20 27:21	roommates 29:24, 25	serving 21:5 49:21 58:11
registry 35:18	require 27:21	run 20:5	rule 27:4	set 11:18,19 19:19 24:5 104:24
regularly 20:12 64:13	require- 81:14	Russell 35:5	screen 9:10,12 33:3 38:8 55:15 78:4	sets 100:8
regulations 25:20	required 27:15		scroll 55:21 78:10 105:20	settlement 40:21 41:13,16 42:9 43:11
relate 101:22 104:22	requisites 18:13		seeking 99:14	share 94:19
related 34:24	res- 101:6			shared 30:4 32:3 68:9,13,20 70:18 71:7,15
relating 7:19 32:13	research 24:23,25 25:2			short 12:22 61:24 106:14
relation 67:22 68:6	reservation 6:24			
relationship 29:10 30:5 32:8	reserve 107:3			
relative 104:11	resign 66:15			
relied 97:13	resigned 62:20			
rely 91:7,12				
remember 59:7 105:17				
remotely 6:19				

Index: show..transferred

show 82:25 92:18	spend 22:25	subset 12:14	74:15,18	time 9:11,24 11:25 16:25 17:5,12 18:8 19:25 20:2,24 21:2,4, 9,10 22:10,12,14,18, 25 24:13 27:25 28:11 30:8 34:21 35:16,24 40:16 41:19 42:22 43:12 45:8 50:8 53:8 57:22 61:25 63:2 70:8 71:5 80:7,10 88:10,18 89:3 98:20 106:2,9,16,24 107:7, 12
showed 81:4 82:25	spent 20:2 21:9,10	subsidiary 104:10	ten 11:17 17:6 83:24	times 13:4 63:12,15
showing 9:9	spoke 35:24 63:19 65:10 67:9 87:19	substance 9:19 44:14 64:23 65:4,19 80:24 91:2	term 20:22 100:21,22	timing 40:19
shown 52:22	spoken 7:3 63:8,12, 17,19	substantial 83:15 104:22	terminate 96:10 98:24	title 11:10,12 24:25
shows 53:3,6	standpoint 104:20, 21	substantive 81:9 100:4	terminating 99:15	today 6:11 7:9 9:9 26:10 30:6 68:23 86:4 98:22 106:11
sic 73:22	Stang 6:8	substantively 92:12	termination 100:12, 14	told 45:3 89:9 91:20 92:8
side 51:5,8	start 29:2 46:24 63:7	substitute 104:14,15	terminology 42:9	topic 40:16 45:18
sign 66:24	started 82:8	success 100:13	terms 12:19 13:2,6 16:16 45:22 52:16 69:6 94:25	touch 27:9
signature 55:23	stated 73:6	sufficient 26:10 82:19	test 45:24 47:10 63:14	track 100:13
signed 93:21	statement 98:2	suggest 99:7 102:13	testified 6:5 9:20,21 22:4 62:10 75:4 85:4	trade 67:17
significant 36:13	status 85:25 91:17 94:4	suggested 96:8	testify 7:22 37:3	traded 85:14
simple 44:21	step 8:24	suit 96:3	testifying 72:24	trades 82:6,15 83:7, 22 84:5,8,13 85:11 86:4 87:10,16
simply 26:8	steps 23:10 39:22 81:10 82:19 96:10 98:24 101:17	suite 106:6	testimony 89:18	trading 77:17,22 84:21 85:14,16
single 88:21	sticking 45:16	summarize 39:10	text 45:11	training 24:19 25:9, 15
sir 55:15 74:21	stop 77:17,21 82:6 83:6 85:13,16 91:5	Super 7:25	there'd 94:14	transaction 88:22, 25
sister 60:9,11,14	stoppage 84:21	support 40:4 102:19 106:9	thing 92:7 99:22 100:3	transactions 24:7 27:16,23 80:6 88:14 89:11 92:10 93:25 95:10 96:2
sit 68:23 79:25	stopping 94:8,9	Surgent 15:4 20:17	things 17:23 21:25 23:12 24:3 29:19 30:16,17 64:16 100:15	transcript 6:23 7:2 83:5
siv- 60:14	strain 30:12	suspects 63:20	thinking 37:13	transfer 29:11 35:12 76:25
small 33:3	strained 30:7	sworn 6:3 107:18	third-party 73:9 101:19	transferred 24:5 29:3,6,13,14,20 35:18
smallest 23:16	strategy 26:4	T	Thomas 15:4 20:17 24:23	
sole 17:4 18:20 19:17 34:7 47:16 50:22 51:12,16 73:23	strike 48:11 81:22	taking 101:18	thought 18:5 21:7 32:16 38:3,15 40:10 42:2 44:2 48:17 68:4 75:4 77:4 85:4 94:9, 12 95:9,13,25 102:24	
soon-to-be 100:13	structure 11:7 12:16 45:18,20 46:15 47:19,20 48:2,8,10, 13 52:19	talk 45:18	thoughts 39:2	
sophomore 29:4	subject 6:23 7:17 64:2,7 66:8 81:2 98:13	talked 22:16 61:6 98:5	threw 96:3	
sort 64:15 100:5,16	submitted 42:14	talking 13:4 57:5,9 102:12	Throckmorton 63:20 64:3,9,14 67:8	
sorts 24:7	subpoena 9:22,25 10:4,7,12	tangent 44:25	Tim 15:4	
soup 19:23 70:6	Subscribed 107:18	tax 17:25 18:10		
source 30:12 87:7	subsequent 6:18 36:11 38:10 81:10	taxes 20:5		
speak 40:15,17 43:9 63:21 95:8,22 102:2		team 85:20,21,22 86:25 87:9		
speaking 8:17 102:25		Tech 29:16		
speci- 86:24		technical 11:10		
specifically 11:12 36:25 40:9 86:22				
specifics 79:13				
speculate 40:7				

transfers 64:16 transition 23:8 transitioned 25:4 transmitted 35:2 trick 9:11 triggers 27:9 trust 58:23 59:2,5,9, 11,18,23,25 60:6,16 61:7,8,12,15,16,20, 22 trusted 32:12 trustee 11:13 58:25 59:4,22 60:5,15,19 trustees 59:8 trusts 30:25 31:6 58:18 60:2,24 61:2 tuck 36:18 tucked 36:19 Tuesday 21:15 90:21 turn 71:19 turnover 20:20 type 18:5,7 <hr/> U <hr/> Uh-huh 9:16 ultimately 36:8 47:23 54:15 70:15 75:3 unanimous 54:25 55:17 unaware 70:10 under- 23:14 37:12 understand 9:4 11:13,22,23 14:14 15:15 17:23 18:8 19:10 23:11 27:18 29:19 31:12 33:13 36:6 38:20 42:5,9 43:3 54:13 70:24 71:18 73:21 81:6 89:3 100:24 101:7 102:8 104:9,24 106:3	understanding 11:16 13:21 17:22 18:16 23:24 29:10 32:7,15 47:2 49:6 50:6 53:15 60:14 61:5,18 65:16 73:13, 14,15 83:3 84:22 97:19,22 101:11,13 103:7 understood 86:6,13 undisputably 37:6 University 24:19,21 25:8 28:24 29:5,15, 16 unlike 20:9,10 updated 88:2 urgent 44:7 usual 63:20 UVA 28:24,25 29:2, 12,21,24 <hr/> V <hr/> valid 42:12 vehicles 58:19 77:5 versus 27:11 34:22 47:14 83:17 85:9 view 83:15 87:15 94:17,19,23 103:12, 13 views 103:2 Virginia 24:20 28:24 29:16 virtual 9:7 virtue 8:10 82:24 vision 32:13,17 voice 87:25 voluntarily 9:20 volunteered 36:3 88:8 volunteering 95:12	<hr/> W <hr/> wanted 17:24 29:18 Watson 24:24 wedding 30:22 week 21:11,18,20 60:20 67:10 87:20 week-to-week 19:25 weekly 21:3 weeks 21:18 60:20 66:14 well-known 29:21 75:22,23 wire 64:16 with- 45:3 withdraw 43:10 45:3,4 92:21 96:4 withdrawing 42:21 withdrawn 13:20 16:10 26:22 28:3 31:4 34:4,6 39:16 45:8 52:4 57:18 59:16 63:25 64:6 65:10 77:10 79:17 86:10 word 41:2 words 8:25 work 42:6 worked 15:3 42:6 85:22 working 20:2 38:14 95:16 works 23:14 world 16:15 31:23 75:16,20 Wright 78:7 96:23 write 45:10 written 8:11 54:25 55:18 62:14 77:20 wrong 22:11 68:25 69:15 73:25 75:6 wrote 8:6,9	<hr/> Y <hr/> year 29:4,7 85:15 105:25 years 7:15 8:2 11:17 15:3 17:6 18:17 28:24 29:8 31:8,20 32:2 59:6 60:17 73:20 76:10 83:25 84:5 yes-or-no 79:11 yesterday 26:9 yielded 81:3 York 24:24 35:8 <hr/> Z <hr/> Ziehl 6:8	
--	---	---	--	--

EXHIBIT 13

Between

CLO HOLDCO, LTD.

And

HARBOURVEST DOVER STREET IX INVESTMENT L.P.

And

HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL AIF L.P.

And

HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL FUND L.P.

And

HV INTERNATIONAL VIII SECONDARY L.P.

And

HARBOURVEST SKEW BASE AIF L.P.

And

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

And

LEE BLACKWELL PARKER, III

And

QUEST IRA, INC., FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311

And

QUEST IRA, INC., FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811

And

QUEST IRA, INC., FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612

And

QUEST IRA, INC., FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211

And

HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD.

And

HIGHLAND HCF ADVISOR, LTD.

MEMBERS AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE COMPANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTERPRETATION.....	2
2.	THE BUSINESS OF THE COMPANY	4
3.	VOTING RIGHTS.....	4
4.	ADVISORY BOARD	4
5.	DEFAULTING MEMBERS	4
6.	TRANSFERS OR DISPOSALS OF SHARES	4
7.	CONFIDENTIALITY.....	4
8.	DIVIDENDS	9
9.	TERM OF THE COMPANY	9
10.	ERISA MATTERS.....	9
11.	TAX MATTERS	9
12.	AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.....	9
13.	FINANCIAL REPORTS	9
14.	TERMINATION AND LIQUIDATION.....	9
15.	WHOLE AGREEMENT	12
16.	STATUS OF AGREEMENT.....	12
17.	ASSIGNMENTS.....	12
18.	VARIATION AND WAIVER.....	12
19.	SERVICE OF NOTICE	12
20.	GENERAL	13
21.	GOVERNING LAW AND JURISDICTION	14
	SCHEDULE	18
	Adherence Agreement.....	18

THIS AGREEMENT is made the 15th day of November 2017

BETWEEN

- (1) CLO HOLDCO, LTD. whose registered office address is at Intertrust Corporate Services (Cayman) Limited, 190 Elgin Avenue, George Town, Grand Cayman KY1-9005, Cayman Islands;
- (2) HARBOURVEST DOVER IX INVESTMENT L.P. of c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC, One Financial Center, 44th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, USA
- (3) HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL AIF L.P. of c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC, One Financial Center, 44th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, USA
- (4) HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL FUND L.P. of c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC, One Financial Center, 44th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, USA
- (5) HV INTERNATIONAL VIII SECONDARY L.P. of c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC, One Financial Center, 44th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, USA
- (6) HARBOURVEST SKEW BASE AIF L.P. of c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC, One Financial Center, 44th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, USA
- (7) HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P. of 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75201, USA
- (8) LEE BLACKWELL PARKER, III of 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75201, USA
- (9) QUEST IRA, INC., FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311 of 17171 Park Row #100, Houston, Texas 77084, USA
- (10) QUEST IRA, INC., FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811 of 17171 Park Row #100, Houston, Texas 77084, USA
- (11) QUEST IRA, INC., FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612 of 17171 Park Row #100, Houston, Texas 77084, USA
- (12) QUEST IRA, INC., FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211 of 17171 Park Row #100, Houston, Texas 77084, USA

(together the "Members") and

- (13) HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD., with registration number 60120 whose registered office is at First Floor, Dorey Court, Admiral Park, St Peter Port, Guernsey GY1 6HJ, Channel Islands (the "Company") and
- (14) HIGHLAND HCF ADVISOR, LTD., whose registered address is at Maples Corporate Services Limited, PO Box 309, Ugland House, Grand Cayman, KY1-1104, Cayman Islands (the "Portfolio Manager").

WHEREAS:

- (A) The Company is a limited company incorporated under the laws of the Island of Guernsey on 30 March 2015.
- (B) The Company has been established to provide its investors with exposure to CLO Notes on both a direct basis and indirect basis and senior secured loans on an indirect basis, through the use of the investments described in its investment policy as set forth in the Offering Memorandum dated 15 November 2017, the (the "Offering Memorandum"), subject to the restrictions set forth therein.

1. INTERPRETATION

1.1 the following words and expressions shall have the following meanings, unless they are inconsistent with the context:

"Advisers Act" shall mean the U.S. Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended from time to time, and the rules and regulations of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission promulgated thereunder;

"Affiliate" means, with respect to a person, (i) any other person who, directly or indirectly, is in control of, or controlled by, or is under common control with, such person or (ii) any other person who is a director, officer or employee (a) of such person, (b) of any subsidiary or parent company of such person or (c) of any person described in clause (i) above. For the purposes of this definition, control of a person shall mean the power, direct or indirect, (i) to vote more than 50% of the securities having ordinary voting power for the election of directors of such persons or (ii) to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of such person whether by contract or otherwise. For purposes of this definition, the management of an account by one person for the benefit of any other person shall not constitute "control" of such other person and no entity shall be deemed an "Affiliate" of the Company solely because the administrator or its Affiliates serve as administrator or share trustee for such entity;

"Agreement" means this agreement together with the Schedule;

"Articles" means the articles of incorporation of the Company as amended from time to time;

"Business" means the business of the Company as described in Recital (B);

"Business Day" means a day (other than a Saturday or Sunday) on which banks are open for ordinary banking business in Guernsey;

"Directors" means the directors of the Company from time to time;

"CLO Holdco" means CLO Holdco, Ltd. (or any permitted successor to the business of CLO Holdco, Ltd. or interest in the Company);

"Code" shall mean the U.S. Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended from time to time.

"Directors" means the directors of the Company from time to time;

"Dover IX" means HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. (or any permitted successor to the business of HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. or any interest in the Company);

"DOL" shall mean the U.S. Department of Labor, or any governmental agency that succeeds to the powers and functions thereof.

"DOL Regulations" shall mean the regulations of the DOL included within 29 C.F.R. section 2510.3-101.

"Dover IX" shall mean HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. (or any permitted successor to the business of HarbourVest Dover Street IX Investment L.P. or interest in the Company);

"ERISA" shall mean the U.S. Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended from time to time;

"ERISA Member" shall mean a Member that (a) is a "benefit plan investor" (as such term is defined in the DOL Regulations as modified by section 3(42) of ERISA) subject to the fiduciary responsibility provisions of part 4 of title I of ERISA or is a "plan" (as such term is defined in section 4975(e) of the Code) subject to section 4975 of the Code or (b) is designated as an ERISA Member by the General Partner in writing on or before the date at which such ERISA Member is admitted to the Company;

"HarbourVest Entities" means: Dover IX; HarbourVest 2017 Global AIF L.P.; HarbourVest 2017 Global Fund L.P.; HV International VIII Secondary L.P.; and HarbourVest Skew Base AIF L.P. (or any of their respective permitted successors to their businesses or interests in the Company);

"Highland Principals" means: Highland Capital Management, L.P.; Lee Blackwell Parker, III, Quest IRA, Inc., fbo Lee B. Parker III Acct. # 3058311; Quest IRA, Inc., fbo Hunter Covitz Acct. # 1469811; Quest IRA, Inc., fbo Jon Poglitsch Acct. # 1470612; Quest IRA, Inc., fbo Neil Desai Acct. # 3059211 (or any of their respective permitted successors to their businesses or interests in the Company);

"Law" means the Companies (Guernsey) Law, 2008, as amended;

"Member" means a person whose name is from time to time entered in the register of members of the Company as the holder of shares in the Company;

"Parties" means the parties to this Agreement and any other person who agrees to be bound by the terms of this Agreement under an Adherence Agreement;

"Shares" means ordinary shares in the Company;

"Subsidiary" shall have the meaning ascribed to it in the Law;

"Subscription and Transfer Agreement" means the Subscription and Transfer Agreement, dated as of 15 November 2017, entered into by and among CLO HoldCo, Ltd. and each of the Members and acknowledged and agreed by the Company and the Portfolio Manager.

Any capitalized terms used herein without definition have the meanings specified in the Offering Memorandum.

- 1.2 any reference to the Parties being obliged to procure shall so far as they are able includes, without limitation, procuring by the exercise of votes which they directly or indirectly control at meetings of the Directors or general meetings of the Company;
- 1.3 any reference to a person includes, where appropriate, that person's heirs, personal representatives and successors;
- 1.4 any reference to a person includes any individual, body corporate, corporation, firm, unincorporated association, organisation, trust or partnership;
- 1.5 any reference to time shall be to Guernsey time;
- 1.6 except where the context otherwise requires words denoting the singular include the plural and vice versa and words denoting any one gender include all genders;

in the reasonable opinion of the Portfolio Manager, the determination of the value of the assets of the Company, would not be reasonably practicable or would be seriously prejudicial to the Members taken as a whole; (iii) during any breakdown in the means of communication normally employed in determining the price or value of the Company's assets or liabilities, or of current prices in any market as aforesaid, or when for any other reason the prices or values of any assets or liabilities of the Company cannot reasonably be accurately ascertained within a reasonable time frame; (iv) during any period when the transfer of funds involved in the realization or acquisition of any investments cannot, in the reasonable opinion of the Portfolio Manager, be effected at normal rates of exchange; or (v) automatically upon liquidation of the Company.

4. ADVISORY BOARD.

4.1 Composition of Advisory Board. The Company shall establish an advisory board (the "Advisory Board") composed of two individuals, one of whom shall be a representative of CLO Holdco and one of whom shall be a representative of Dover IX (or, in each case, or any permitted successor to the interest in the Company of such Member). No voting member of the Advisory Board shall be a controlled Affiliate of the Portfolio Manager (including, for the avoidance of doubt, following a permitted transfer of CLO Holdco's interest to an Affiliate of the Portfolio Manager, if applicable), it being understood that for the purposes of this sentence none of CLO Holdco, its wholly-owned subsidiaries nor any of their respective directors or trustees shall be deemed to be a controlled Affiliate of the Portfolio Manager due to their pre-existing non-discretionary advisory relationship with the Portfolio Manager. None of the members of the Advisory Board shall receive any compensation (other than reimbursement for reasonable and documented out-of-pocket expenses) in connection with their position on the Advisory Board. The Company shall bear any fees, costs and expenses related to the Advisory Board.

4.2 Meetings of Advisory Board; Written Consents. The Advisory Board shall meet with the Portfolio Manager at such times as requested by the Portfolio Manager from time to time. The quorum for a meeting of the Advisory Board shall be all of its members entitled to vote. All actions taken by the Advisory Board shall be (i) by a unanimous vote of all of the members of the Advisory Board in attendance in a meeting at which a quorum is present and entitled to vote and not abstaining from voting or (ii) by a written consent in lieu of a meeting signed by all of the members of the Advisory Board entitled to consent and not abstaining from consenting. Meetings of the Advisory Board may be held in person, by telephone or by other electronic device.

4.3 Functions of Advisory Board. The Advisory Board shall provide (or determine not to provide) any consents or approvals expressly contemplated by this Agreement and the Offering Memorandum to be provided by the Advisory Board and, at the request of the Portfolio Manager in its sole discretion, provide general advice (which, for the avoidance of doubt, shall be non-binding) to the Portfolio Manager or the Company with regard to Company activities and operations and other matters. For the avoidance of doubt, no consent or approval of the Advisory Board shall be required for any action or determination expressly permitted or contemplated hereunder or in the Offering Memorandum and not conditioned on such a consent or approval. The Portfolio Manager shall not act contrary to the advice of the Advisory Board with respect to any action or determination expressly conditioned herein or in the Offering Memorandum on the consent or approval of the Advisory Board. Without limiting the foregoing, the Advisory Board shall be authorized to give any approval or consent required or deemed necessary or advisable under the Advisers Act on behalf of the Company and the Members, including under Section 206(3) of the Advisers Act. The Portfolio Manager may from time to time in its discretion request the Advisory Board to review and ratify certain Company matters. The consent of the Advisory Board shall be required to approve the following actions: (i) any extension of the Investment Period; (ii) any extension of the Term (other than an automatic extension following an extension of the Investment Period that has been approved by the Advisory Board); (iii) any allotment of additional equity securities by the Company; and (iv) any investment in a Related Obligation or any other transaction between the Company or any entity in which the Company holds a direct or indirect interest, on the one hand, and Highland or any of its Affiliates, on the other hand and (v) other matters as set forth in the Offering

Memorandum. Notwithstanding the foregoing or anything to the contrary set forth herein, no transaction that is specifically authorized in the governing documents of the Company shall require approval of the Advisory Board, including, without limitation, sales or securitizations of all or a portion of the Company's loan portfolio into new Qualifying CLOs (i.e. the transfer of warehoused assets into new Qualifying CLOs), investments in CLO Notes issued by CLOs managed by Highland Affiliates, and the NexBank Credit Facility and any Permitted NexBank Credit Facility Amendments, in each case as described in the Offering Memorandum. Any such approval, consent or ratification given by the Advisory Board shall be binding on the Company and the Members. Neither the Advisory Board nor any member thereof shall have the power to bind or act for or on behalf of the Company in any manner, and no shareholder who appoints a member of the Advisory Board shall be deemed to be an Affiliate of the Company or Highland solely by reason of such appointment.

4.4 Term of Members of Advisory Board. A member of the Advisory Board shall be deemed removed from the Advisory Board (i) if such member is no longer an officer, director, manager, trustee, employee, consultant or other representative of CLO Holdco or Dover IX, as applicable, or their respective Affiliates and shall be replaced as soon as practicable with a representative of CLO Holdco or Dover IX, or their respective Affiliates, as applicable, or (ii) if the Member represented by such member either becomes a Defaulting Member or such member ceases to be eligible to represent such Member pursuant to Clause 4.1.

4.5 No Duties to Other Members. No Advisory Board member who is the representative of any Member shall, to the extent permitted by law, owe a fiduciary duty to the Company or any other Member (other than the duty to act in good faith), and may, to the fullest extent permitted by law, in all instances act in such member's own interest and in the interest of the Member that appointed such member.

5. DEFAULTING MEMBERS

5.1 In the event any Member defaults in its obligation to pay the full amount of the purchase price of Shares called for settlement under the Subscription and Transfer Agreement on the applicable Settlement Date (such unpaid amount, an "Outstanding Settlement Amount"), the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, shall provide written or telephonic notice of such default to such Member. If such default is not cured within 5 business days after written (or if applicable telephonic or email) notice thereof given by the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, has been received by such Member, such Outstanding Settlement Amount shall automatically accrue interest on a retroactive basis from the date such Outstanding Settlement Amount was due at 12% (the "Default Interest Rate") (which interest, once paid, shall not be applied to the purchase of the unsettled Shares of such Member, but which will upon receipt be distributed pro rata to those Members who have funded any such Outstanding Settlement Amounts pursuant to this Clause 5). No such Shares which have failed to be settled will be issued to any Member until settlement of the full amount of the purchase price has been made. In addition, if such default is not cured within 10 business days after written or telephonic notice thereof given by the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, has been received by such Member (a "Defaulting Member"), the following provisions shall apply:

5.2 Whenever the vote or consent of the Defaulting Member would otherwise be required or permitted hereunder or under the Articles, the Defaulting Member shall not be entitled to participate in such vote or consent in respect of his existing shareholding and with respect to any representative of such Defaulting Member on the Advisory Board, and such vote or consent shall be calculated as if such Defaulting Member were not a Member and, as applicable, any representative of such Defaulting Member on the Advisory Board were not a member of the Advisory Board.

5.3 The Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, may pursue and enforce all rights and remedies available, including the commencement of legal proceedings against the Defaulting Member to collect the Outstanding Settlement Amounts, together with interest thereon for the account of the Company from the date due at the Default Interest Rate, plus the costs and expenses of collection (including attorneys' fees and expenses).

- 5.4 The Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, may (at the sole cost of the Defaulting Member) borrow funds from any person (other than the Defaulting Member or its Affiliates) to cover such shortfall and/or advance all or a portion of the Defaulting Member's Outstanding Settlement Amount to the Company on behalf of the Defaulting Member, and such advance shall be repaid by the Defaulting Member to the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, with interest for the account of the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, on the amount outstanding from time to time commencing on the date of the advance at the Default Interest Rate. To the extent the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, advances funds to the Company on behalf of a Defaulting Member, all distributions from the Company that would otherwise be made to the Defaulting Member shall be paid to the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, (with any such amounts being applied first against accrued but unpaid interest and then against principal), until all amounts payable by the Defaulting Member to the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, under this Clause 5.4 (including interest) have been paid in full.
- 5.5 The Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, may elect, upon notice to the Defaulting Member, to redeem the Defaulting Member's shares in an amount equal to 50% of the outstanding amount existing as of the date of the default at a price of \$0.0001 per Share. Thereupon, the commitment of the Defaulting Member under the Subscription and Transfer Agreement shall be zero, the Defaulting Member shall not be obligated to make any further settlements, the voting capital of such Defaulting Member and of each other Member shall be re-determined as of the date of such default to reflect the new commitment of the Defaulting Member, and the Portfolio Manager shall revise the books and records of the Company to reflect the reduction of the commitment of the Defaulting Member. The Members agree (x) that the damages suffered by the Company as the result of a failure by a Member to settle a commitment to purchase Shares that is required by this Agreement cannot be estimated with reasonable accuracy and (y) that the foregoing provisions of this Clause 5.5 shall act as liquidated damages for the default by the Defaulting Member (which each Member hereby agrees are reasonable).
- 5.6 The Board may offer to the non-Defaulting Members (pro rata in accordance with their respective Commitments) the option of purchasing the Defaulting Member's unsettled Shares on the terms set forth in the applicable Settlement Notice (as defined in the Subscription and Transfer Agreement).
- 5.7 At the election of the Board, distributions of dividends otherwise payable to the Defaulting Member under the Articles shall not be paid to the Defaulting Member, but instead shall be applied against the amount of the Outstanding Settlement Amount (plus interest at the Default Interest Rate and related costs); provided that any amounts so applied shall be deemed to have been distributed to the Defaulting Member under the Articles.
- 5.8 The Portfolio Manager may send an amended or new Settlement Notice to the Members other than the Defaulting Member in an amount equal to the Defaulting Member's Outstanding Settlement Amount and otherwise in accordance with the Subscription and Transfer Agreement.
- 5.9 Each Defaulting Member further appoints the Portfolio Manager as agent and attorney-in-fact for the Defaulting Member and hereby grants to the Portfolio Manager an irrevocable power of attorney to take all actions necessary on its behalf to sell, assign, or transfer the commitment to purchase unsettled Shares of such Defaulting Member pursuant to Clause 5.6 or as necessary on its behalf to effect the other remedies or rights set forth in this Clause 5; provided that the Portfolio Manager shall not bind any Defaulting Member to an indemnification or other similar obligation which guarantees the financial performance of the Company or which exceeds the ability of the Defaulting Member to provide indemnification under applicable law.
6. TRANSFERS OR DISPOSALS OF SHARES
 - 6.1 No Member shall sell, pledge, charge, mortgage, assign, assign by way of security, transfer, convey, exchange or otherwise dispose of its Shares or its commitment to settle purchases of Shares under the Subscription and Transfer Agreement (each a "Transfer"), other than to an Affiliate of an initial Member party hereto, without the prior written consent of the Portfolio

Manager, which consent shall be in the sole discretion of the Portfolio Manager; provided that no such Transfer shall be made unless in the opinion of counsel reasonably satisfactory to the Portfolio Manager (who may be counsel for the Company, and which requirement for an opinion may be waived, in whole or in part, in the sole discretion of the Portfolio Manager) that:

- 6.1.1 such Transfer would not require registration under the Securities Act or any state securities or "Blue Sky" laws or other laws applicable to the Shares to be assigned or transferred and is conducted in conformance with the restrictions set forth in the Offering Memorandum;
 - 6.1.2 such Transfer would not be reasonably likely to cause the Company to be subject to tax in any jurisdiction other than of its incorporation on a net income basis, not be reasonably likely to cause the Company to become subject to registration as an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended;
 - 6.1.3 such Transfer would not cause the Company to be considered to be an entity whose underlying assets are considered to include "plan assets" by reason of investment by an "employee benefit plan" or "plan" in such entity pursuant to the U.S. Plan Assets Regulations; and
 - 6.1.4 such sale, assignment, disposition or transfer would not to cause all or any portion of the assets of the Company to constitute "plan assets" under ERISA or the Code.
- 6.2 Prior to making any Transfer of Shares (other than Transfers to Affiliates of an initial Member or, in the case of CLO Holdco or a Highland Principal, to Highland, its Affiliates or another Highland Principal) a Member must first offer to the other Members a right to purchase the Shares, on a pro rata basis with respect to their current Shares, at the same price (which must be cash) as such Shares are proposed to be purchased by the prospective third party purchaser pursuant to an irrevocable offer letter. The other Members will have 30 days following receipt of the letter to determine whether to purchase their entire pro rata portion of the Shares proposed to be Transferred. If the other Members do not accept the offer, the Member may (subject to complying with the other Transfer restrictions in this Agreement) Transfer the applicable Shares that such Members have not elected to purchase to a third party at a price equal to or greater than the price described in the offer letter, provided that if the Member has not (a) entered into a definitive agreement to effect such sale within 90 days after the expiration of the period that the other Members have to accept the offer in the offer letter or (b) consummated the sale within 120 day after the entry into the definitive agreement to consummate the sale, it must comply with these right of first refusal procedures again. Any Member (other than the Member proposing to Transfer its Shares) may assign its right to purchase its pro rata portion of the Shares to any other Member (subject to complying with the other Transfer restrictions in this Agreement), any initial Member (other than the Member proposing to Transfer its Shares) may assign its right to purchase its pro rata portion of the Shares to an Affiliate (subject to complying with the other Transfer restrictions in this Agreement), and CLO Holdco and the Highland Principals (unless such Member is the Member proposing the Transfer its Shares) may assign its right to purchase its pro rata portion of the Shares to Highland, an Affiliate of Highland or other Highland Principals (subject to complying with the other Transfer restrictions in this Agreement).
- 6.3 No Highland Principal may transfer his or its interests in the Company other than (i) to a trust or other tax or estate planning vehicle or (ii) to the Portfolio Manager, its Affiliates or another Highland Principal upon the termination of such Highland Principal's (or the beneficial owner of such Highland Principal, if applicable) employment by Highland Capital Management, L.P.
- 6.4 Any transferor of any Share shall remain bound by the terms of this Agreement applicable to it prior to such transfer and that nothing in this Agreement shall constitute a waiver of any rights a Party to this Agreement may have by reason of a breach of this Agreement by a transferor prior to transfer. The transferor and/or the transferee shall bear all costs of any Transfer.
- 6.5 The Parties agree not to Transfer their Shares to any person unless such transferee agrees to be bound by the terms of this Agreement.
- 6.6 All Adherence Agreements executed pursuant to this Clause shall be executed by the transferee or allottee and each Party.

7. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 7.1 Each Party agrees to keep any information received by it pursuant to this Agreement or relating to the Business as confidential and not (save with the relevant Party's consent or as may be required by Law or the rules of any regulatory authority or any stock exchange) disclose to any person such information.
- 7.2 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Parties agree that the HarbourVest Entities may disclose to their limited partners and prospective limited partners (including any agents of such limited partners or prospective limited partners), clients and applicable governmental agencies (a) the name and address of the Company, (b) the capital commitment and the remaining capital commitment, (c) the net asset value of such HarbourVest Entity's interest in the Company, (d) the amount of distributions that have been made to such HarbourVest Entity by the Company and the amount of contributions that have been made by such HarbourVest Entity to the Company, (e) such ratios and performance information calculated by such HarbourVest Entity using the information in clauses (a) through (d) above, including the ratio of net asset value plus distributions to contributions (i.e., the "multiple") and such HarbourVest Entity's internal rate of return with respect to its investment in the Company, and (f) tax information with respect to the Company.

8. DIVIDENDS

- 8.1 The Company agrees that it shall not, and the Portfolio Manager agrees it shall not cause the Company to, make any dividends except pursuant to the section titled "Summary—Dividend Policy" of the Offering Memorandum.

9. TERM OF THE COMPANY

- 9.1 Each Party agrees to cause the winding up and dissolution of the Company after the ten year anniversary of the date hereof (the "Term"); provided that the Portfolio Manager, in its reasonable discretion, may postpone dissolution of the Company for up to 180 days in order to facilitate orderly liquidation of the investments; provided, further, that the Term shall be automatically extended for any amount of time for which the Investment Period may be extended.
- 9.2 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Term may be extended with the consent of the Portfolio Manager and the Advisory Board for up to two successive periods of one year each.

10. ERISA MATTERS

- 10.1 The Portfolio Manager, the Company and each Member shall use their reasonable best efforts to conduct the affairs and operations of the Company so as to limit investment in the Company by "benefit plan investors" (within the meaning of the DOL Regulations as modified by section 3(42) of ERISA) to less than the U.S. Plan Threshold. In the event the U.S. Plan Threshold is met or exceeded, the Portfolio Manager, on behalf of the Company, may require any Non-Qualified Holder that is a U.S. Plan Investor to sell or transfer their Shares to a person qualified to own the same that is not a U.S. Plan Investor within 30 days and within such 30 days and to provide the Company with satisfactory evidence of such sale or transfer such that such sale or transfer, together with other sale or transfers pursuant to this Clause, would result in the investment in the Company by "benefit plan investors" (within the meaning of the DOL Regulations as modified by section 3(42) of ERISA) to be less than the U.S. Plan Threshold. Where the conditions above are not satisfied within 30 days after the serving of the notice to transfer, such Non-Qualified Holder will be deemed, upon the expiration of such 30 days, to have forfeited their Shares.

11. TAX MATTERS

- 11.1 PFIC. For each fiscal year of the Company, the Company will no later than 120 days after the end of such fiscal year, commencing with the first fiscal year for which the Company is determined to be a PFIC (a "passive foreign investment company"), furnish to each of the

HarbourVest Entities (x) all information necessary to permit such HarbourVest Entity or any of its partners to complete United States Internal Revenue Service Form 8621 with respect to their interests in the Company and (y) a PFIC Annual Information Statement under section 1295(b) of the Code with respect to the Company; provided that if the Company is unable to furnish such final information and Statement within such 120 days, then the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to furnish estimates of such information and Statement on or before the 120th day after the end of such fiscal year.

11.2 CFC. The Company shall furnish to each of the HarbourVest Entities within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of the Company, a United States Internal Revenue Service Form 5471 for such fiscal year, completed for all information concerning the Company required to be filed by such HarbourVest Entity or any of its partners (i.e., all portions applicable to the relevant category of filer other than page 1 items A-D and page 2 Schedule B), to the extent such Form 5471 is required to be filed by such HarbourVest Entity or any of its partners; provided that if the Company is unable to furnish such final information within such 120 days, then the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to furnish estimates of such information on or before the 120th day after the end of each fiscal year.

11.3 Other Tax Information. The Company shall furnish to each of the HarbourVest Entities (a) within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year of the Company such other information reasonably requested by the HarbourVest Entities that any HarbourVest Entity may require in order for it or any of its partners to comply with its U.S. federal income tax reporting obligations with respect to its interest in the Company; provided that if the Company is unable to furnish such final information within such 120 days, then the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to furnish estimates of such information on or before the 120th day after the end of such fiscal year and (b) promptly upon request such other information reasonably requested by such HarbourVest Entity in order to withhold tax or to file tax returns and reports or to furnish tax information to any of its partners with respect to the Company.

11.4 Withholding and Other Taxes. The Company will use reasonable best efforts to acquire investments that will not result in withholding or other taxes being imposed directly or indirectly on the Company by any jurisdiction with respect to income or distributions from such investments.

12. AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS

12.1 The Portfolio Manager and the Company shall not amend or terminate, or agree to amend or terminate, the Memorandum or Articles of Incorporation of the Company or that certain Portfolio Management Agreement between the Portfolio Manager and the Company dated as of the date hereof (the "Management Agreement") without the consent of the Parties.

12.2 The Portfolio Manager agrees that it shall not assign its rights, duties and obligations under the Management Agreement without the consent of the Members totalling in the aggregate more than seventy-five percent (75%) of the Company. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Portfolio Manager may, without the consent of the Members, assign any of its rights or obligations under the Management Agreement to an Affiliate; provided that such Affiliate (A) has demonstrated ability, whether as an entity or by its personnel, to professionally and competently perform duties similar to those imposed upon the Portfolio Manager pursuant to the Management Agreement, (B) has the legal right and capacity to act as Portfolio Manager thereunder and (C) shall not cause the Company or the pool of collateral to become required to register under the provisions of the Investment Company Act and such action does not cause the company to be subject to tax in any jurisdiction outside of its jurisdiction of incorporation.

12.3 The Company agrees that it shall not hire any portfolio manager without the consent of the Parties and such new portfolio manager shall be required to join and abide by this Agreement.

13. FINANCIAL REPORTS

13.1 The books and records of account of the Company shall be audited as of the end of each fiscal year of the Company by a nationally recognized independent public accounting firm selected by

the Portfolio Manager that is registered with, and subject to regular inspection as of the commencement of the professional engagement period, and as of each calendar year-end, by, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board in accordance with its rules. During the Term, the Portfolio Manager or the Company shall prepare and mail, deliver by fax, email or other electronic means or otherwise make available a financial report (audited in the case of a report sent as of the end of a fiscal year and unaudited in the case of a report sent as of the end of a quarter) to each Member on or before the 120th day after the end of each fiscal year and the 45th day after the end of each of the first three quarters of each fiscal year, setting forth for such fiscal year or quarter (a) the assets and liabilities of the Company as of the end of such fiscal year or quarter; (b) the net profit or net loss of the Company for such fiscal year or quarter; and (c) such Member's closing capital account balance as of the end of such fiscal year or quarter; provided that if the Portfolio Manager or the Company is unable to furnish final information with respect to any of the above, then the Portfolio Manager or the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to furnish estimates of such information on or before the 120th day after the end of each fiscal year and the 45th day after the end of the first three quarters of each fiscal year. On or before the 60th day after the end of each fiscal year, the Portfolio Manager or the Company shall provide to each Member an unaudited draft of the financial report for such fiscal year.

- 13.2 After the end of each fiscal year or quarter, the Portfolio Manager or the Company shall cause to be delivered to the Advisory Board a reasonably detailed summary of the expenses incurred by the Company during such period.

14. TERMINATION AND LIQUIDATION

- 14.1 Save as provided for in Clause 13.2, this Agreement shall terminate:

- 14.1.1 when one Party holds all the Shares;
- 14.1.2 when a resolution is passed by the Company's Members or creditors, or an order made by a court or other competent body or person instituting a process that shall lead to the Company being wound up and its assets being distributed among the Company's creditors, Members or other contributors; or
- 14.1.3 with the written consent of all the Parties.

- 14.2 The following provisions of this Agreement remain in full force after termination: Clause 1 (Interpretation), Clause 7 (Confidentiality), this Clause, Clause 14 (Whole Agreement), Clause 16 (Assignments), Clause 17 (Variation and Waiver), Clause 18 (Service of Notice), Clause 19 (General) and Clause 21 (Governing Law and Jurisdiction).

- 14.3 Termination of this Agreement shall not affect any rights or liabilities that the Parties may have accrued under it.

- 14.4 Where the Company is to be wound up and its assets distributed, the Parties shall agree a suitable basis for dealing with the interests and assets of the Company and shall endeavour to ensure that:

- 14.4.1 all existing contracts of the Company are performed to the extent that there are sufficient resources;
- 14.4.2 the Company shall not enter into any new contractual obligations;
- 14.4.3 the Company is dissolved and its assets are distributed as soon as practical; and
- 14.4.4 any other proprietary information belonging to or originating from a Party shall be returned to it by the other Parties.

15. WHOLE AGREEMENT

- 15.1 This Agreement, and any documents referred to in it, constitute the whole agreement between the Parties and supersede any arrangements, understanding or previous agreement between them relating to the subject matter they cover.
- 15.2 Each Party acknowledges that in entering into this Agreement, and any documents referred to in it, it does not rely on, and shall have no remedy in respect of, any statement, representation, assurance or warranty of any person other than as expressly set out in this Agreement or those documents.
- 15.3 Nothing in this Clause 14 operates to limit or exclude any liability for fraud.

16. STATUS OF AGREEMENT

- 16.1 Each Party shall, to the extent that it is able to do so, exercise its voting rights and other powers in relation to the Company to procure that the provisions of this Agreement are properly and promptly observed and given full force and effect according to the spirit and intention of the Agreement.
- 16.2 If any provision in the memorandum of incorporation of the Company or the Articles conflicts with any provision of this Agreement, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail as between the Parties. Each of the Parties shall, to the extent that it is able to do so, exercise its voting rights and other powers in relation to the Company to procure the modification of the memorandum of association of the Company or the Articles (as the case may be) in order to eliminate the conflict, but this Agreement shall not itself constitute a modification of the memorandum of association of the Company or the Articles.

17. ASSIGNMENTS

Save as expressly permitted by this Agreement, no person may assign, or grant any security interest over, any of its rights under this Agreement or any document referred to in it without the prior written consent of the Parties.

18. VARIATION AND WAIVER

- 18.1 A variation of this Agreement shall be in writing and signed by or on behalf of the Parties.
- 18.2 A waiver of any right under this Agreement is only effective if it is in writing and it applies only to the person to which the waiver is addressed and the circumstances for which it is given.
- 18.3 A person that waives a right in relation to one person, or takes or fails to take any action against that person, does not affect its rights against any other person.

19. SERVICE OF NOTICE

- 19.1 Any notice required to be given by any of the Parties may be sent by post or facsimile to the address and facsimile number of the addressee as set out in this Agreement, in either case marked for the attention of the relevant person named below, or to such other address and/or facsimile number and/or marked for the attention of such other person as the addressee may from time to time have notified for the purposes of this Clause.

19.1.1 to the Company:
Address:
First Floor, Dorey Court, Admiral Park
St Peter Port, Guernsey GY1 6HJ
Channel Islands

19.1.2 to CLO Holdco:

Address:
c/o Highland Capital Management, L.P.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75201
Attn: General Counsel
Tel: +1 (972) 628-4100
Email: Notices@highlandcapital.com

19.1.3 to any HarbourVest Entity:

Address:
c/o HarbourVest Partners, LLC
One Financial Center, 44th Floor
Boston, MA 02111
USA
Attn: Michael Pugatch
Tel: +1 (617) 348-3712
F
Email: mpugatch@harbourvest.com

19.1.4 to any other Party: by post or hand delivery only to the address specified in the register of members of the Company.

19.2 Communications sent by post shall be deemed to have been received 24 hours after posting. Communications sent by facsimile transmission shall be deemed to have been received at the time the transmission has been received by the addressee PROVIDED THAT if the facsimile transmission, where permitted, is received after 5.00pm or on a day which is not a Business Day, it shall be deemed to have been received 11.00am the Business Day following thereafter.

19.3 In proving service by post it shall only be necessary to prove that the notice was contained in an envelope which was duly addressed and posted in accordance with this Clause and in the case of facsimile transmission it shall be necessary to prove that the facsimile was duly transmitted to the correct number.

20. GENERAL

20.1 Each of the Parties hereby agree not to enter into or abide by any agreement whether written or oral with any one or more of the other Parties in respect of the voting of Shares or the submission of Member resolutions to any Members for voting by them, or otherwise to direct or influence, or attempt to direct or influence, the day-to-day management of the Company, either directly or indirectly, other than in order to comply with the other terms of this Agreement or the Articles. In this regard, each of the Parties agrees to not to direct or influence or to attempt to direct or influence any of the Directors through any employment relationship that the Directors may have outside of the Company other than in order to comply with the other terms of this Agreement or the Articles. Each of the Parties hereby agree that this provision shall continue to apply to them whether or not they are or remain a Member.

20.2 Unless otherwise provided, all costs in connection with the negotiation, preparation, execution and performance of this Agreement, shall be borne by the Party that incurred the costs.

20.3 The Parties are not in partnership with each other and there is no relationship of principal and agent between them.

20.4 All transactions entered into between any Party and the Company shall be conducted in good faith and on the basis set out or referred to in this Agreement or, if not provided for in this Agreement, as may be agreed by the Parties and, in the absence of such agreement, on an arm's length basis.

20.5 Each Party shall at all times act in good faith towards the other Parties and shall use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that this Agreement is observed.

20.6 Each Party shall promptly execute and deliver all such documents, and do all such things, as the other Parties may from time to time reasonably require for the purpose of giving full effect to the provisions of this Agreement.

20.7 This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which is an original and which together have the same effect as if each Party had signed the same document. This Agreement may not be amended except with the consent of each Party.

21. STATUS OF AGREEMENT

21.1 The Parties shall, when necessary, exercise their powers of voting and any other rights and powers they have to amend, waive or suspend a conflicting provision in the Articles to the extent necessary to permit the Company and its Business to be administered as provided in this Agreement.

21.2 If there is an inconsistency between any of the provisions of this agreement and the provisions of the Articles, the provisions of this agreement shall prevail as between the Parties.

22. GOVERNING LAW AND JURISDICTION

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the Island of Guernsey and each of the Parties submits to the non-exclusive jurisdiction of the Royal Courts of the Island of Guernsey.

[Signature Page Follows.]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed the day and year first before written.

SIGNED for and on behalf of **CLO HOLDCO, LTD.**


By:.....

Name: Grant Scott

Title: Director

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HARBOURVEST DOVER STREET IX INVESTMENT L.P.


By: HarbourVest Partners (Europe) Limited,
its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: 

Name: Michael J. Pugatch
Title: Authorized Person

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL AIF L.P.

By: HarbourVest Partners (Europe) Limited,
its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: 

Name: Michael J. Pugatch
Title: Authorized Person

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HARBOURVEST 2017 GLOBAL FUND L.P.

By: HarbourVest 2017 Global Associates L.P.,
its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC,
its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC,
its Managing Member

By: 

Name: Michael J. Pugatch
Title: Managing Director

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HV INTERNATIONAL VIII SECONDARY L.P.

By: HIPEP VIII Associates L.P.

Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest GP LLC

Its General Partner

By: HarbourVest Partners, LLC

Its Managing Member

By: 

Name: Michael J. Pugatch

Title: Managing Director

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HARBOURVEST SKEW BASE AIF L.P.


By: HarbourVest Partners (Europe) Limited,
its Alternative Investment Fund Manager

By: 

Name: Michael J. Pugatch

Title: Authorized Person


SIGNED



.....
Lee Blackwell Parker, III

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311

Read and approved

By: 
Name: Emmanuel Maciel
Title: Transactions Operator

X 

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811

By:
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612

By:
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211

By:
Name:
Title:


SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811

By:.....
Name: *Emmanuel Mader*
Title: *Transaction Supervisor*

Read & Approved



SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612

By: 
Name: Emmanuel Mager
Title: Transactions Supervisor

Read and Approved:

 11/7/17

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO LEE B. PARKER III, ACCT. # 3058311

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO HUNTER COVITZ, ACCT. # 1469811


By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO JON POGLITSCH, ACCT. # 1470612

By:.....
Name:
Title:

SIGNED for and on behalf of
QUEST IRA, INC.
FBO NEIL DESAI, ACCT. # 3059211

By:.....
Name: Emmanuel Mader
Title: Transaction Supervisor

Read and approved


SIGNED for and on behalf of
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

By: Strand Advisors, Inc.,
its General Partner

By: 

Name: James Dondero

Title: President

SIGNED for and on behalf of
HIGHLAND HCF ADVISOR, LTD.


By:
Name: James Dondero
Title: President

SCHEDULE

Adherence Agreement

THIS ADHERENCE AGREEMENT is made on [] 200[]

BETWEEN:

- (1) [] of [] (the "Covenantor");
- (2) CLO HOLDCO, LTD. of [] (a "Member");
- (3) [] of [] (a "Member");
- (4) [] of [] (a "Member");
- (5) HIGHLAND CLO FUNDING, LTD., with registration number 60120 whose registered office is at First Floor, Dorey Court, Admiral Park, St Peter Port, Guernsey GY1 6HJ, Channel Islands (the "Company")
- (6) HIGHLAND HCF ADVISOR, LTD., registered address is at Maples Corporate Services Limited, PO Box 309, Ugland House, Grand Cayman, KY1-1104, Cayman Islands (the "Portfolio Manager").

RECITAL

This Agreement is supplemental to the members agreement made on November 15 2017 between the Members, the Portfolio Manager and the Company (the "Members Agreement").

IT IS HEREBY AGREED as follows:

1. The Covenantor hereby confirms that he has been supplied with a copy of the Members Agreement and hereby covenants with each of the parties thereto to observe, perform and be bound by all the terms of the Members Agreement as if it were a party thereto.
2. Each of the other parties to the Members Agreement hereby covenants with the Covenantor that the Covenantor shall be entitled to the benefit of the terms of the Members Agreement as if he were a party thereto.
3. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with Guernsey law.

IN WITNESS of which this Agreement has been executed by the Covenantor and each of the parties to the Members Agreement on the date shown above.